SEPTEMBER 1963

MONTHLY REVIEW

N INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 15

5

SOCIALISM AND THE NEGRO MOVEMENT

THE EDITORS

THE NEGRO PROBLEM
AN OUTSIDER'S VIEW

KEITH BUCHANAN

SOUTH AFRICA'S UNDERGROUND

"SOUTH AFRICAN"

The Real West Germany WILLIAM J. BLAKE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: *Socialism and the Negro Movement* 225
THE NEGRO PROBLEM IN THE U.S.—AN OUTSIDER'S VIEW
by Keith Buchanan 235
LESSONS OF THE PHILIPPINE GUERRILLA WAR by William J. Pomeroy.... 246
LATIN AMERICAN ECONOMIC INTEGRATION
by Andrew Gunder Frank.... 252
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 258
BOOKS: SOUTH AFRICA'S UNDERGROUND by "South African" 264
DRAPER REFUTED by William Leiss 270
A QUARTER-CENTURY OF UNAMERICANA
by Alexander L. Crosby 274
THE REAL WEST GERMANY 279
A BOOK ANNOUNCEMENT by the Editors 282

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright, ©1963, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, New York.
Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494.
Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.
NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, N. J.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$6 in the U.S.; $7 foreign.
By 1st class mail—U.S. $9; everywhere else $11.
By air mail—No. America $11; So. America and Europe $15; Asia (incl. USSR), Africa, Australia $17.
EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

Some readers have written in to tell us that our summer double number on *The American Revolution* is "the best thing MR has ever done." That may be true—in any case, the demand for copies has been so great that we have decided to do a second printing of the issue as a $1 paperback. There is no doubt that Jim Boggs has something of importance to say, not only about the Negro revolt but also about American history, past and present. Since he says it so simply and clearly, the job of getting a wider circle of readers should not be as difficult as it usually is with thought-provoking literature. We count on you to see that your local library has the book on its shelves. For organizations to which you belong we offer these bulk rates: 25 to 100 copies, 75¢ per copy; over 100—60¢ per copy. Checks must accompany orders.

In his *I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly*, of July 22nd, our good friend Izzy Stone wrote: "We wish every thoughtful American could read *The War in Vietnam* by Hugh Deane (MR Press, 50¢), a pamphlet which sets out the whole terrible story with eloquence and painful precision." Not *every* thoughtful American has read it yet, but many of Stone's readers have ordered it. Have you?

Another important pamphlet, now on the press and probably ready in September, spells out in detail how the Alliance for Progress actually

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOCIALISM AND THE NEGRO MOVEMENT

We have received a brief article entitled "A Socialist Plea for Black Nationalism" from Marc Schleifer. Marc Schleifer is the young American writer whose moving account of a political awakening appeared in these pages under the title "Cuban Notebook." (MR, July-August, 1961.) His reaction to the present tremendous upsurge of Negro militancy is probably shared in greater or less degree by many of the younger generation of American radicals who are committed to the cause of international socialism and determined to build a new American Left to represent it worthily in their own country. Here is the article in full:

I

Most of the time America is an ugly place to live in. All the "reforms" only seem to have made it uglier. And more sophisticated in its evil.

We all know what thefts, what moral and aesthetic horrors "slum clearance," "public housing," "public health," "social work," and almost every other "progressive" measure or direction in American life turn out to be.

In the long run, what *did* the New Deal do? Besides the Smith Act? Are there other, more flourishing offspring of the corporate and progressive income tax than Madison Avenue, expense-account culture, and the Pentagon? With the exception of Jimmy Hoffa and a few remnant leftist unions, what significance and militant honor is there now in a "strong" trade union movement? Who can better remember Pearl Harbor than the hundreds of thousands of dead Chinese, Koreans, Vietnamese, Laotians, Filipinos, etc., we have killed since the end of the Second World War? Is there any answer to this? Besides showing, for the millionth time, that old documentary movie about TVA bringing light and life to some obscure valley?

The more I come to think of it the more I come to hate my brainwashed childhood's beloved memory of Franklin Delano

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roosevelt. Everybody's liberal Jewish middle-class parents will cry, like mine, if they ever read this. ("After all, didn't he save the Jews and take us out of the Depression?") Because I am a socialist and not a liberal, I know the answer.

The trouble with the American Left is not simply that sections of it don't realize that the New Deal is dead—that the old triple-letter jobs and respectability are gone forever—but that some should want it to live again.

I'm committed for hopeless emotional reasons to worrying about America's destiny, so I dream of the time when some sort of revolutionary socialism will obliterate the existing structure and all its ugliness. *But who can blame anyone for wanting to give the whole thing up?* If individuals can withdraw or expatriate themselves, why not a race?

II

Although there have been tactical differences and preferences (for direct non-violent action as against legalism, for armed self-defense against non-violence), the American Left has nevertheless supported and thrown its energy into the struggle for integration. We have accepted the goal defined by white and black liberals, and that goal is for "integration" under the capitalist system.

Which means that all the heads that are being broken at this moment in the South, and the many more that will be broken, are justified by the thought that some day Southern blacks will have the privilege of having to live like Northern blacks. It also means that the organic quota of our present-day society for *assimilados*—university-educated Afro-Americans who are absorbed into the white culture—will be considerably enlarged. A year or two more of struggle and Ralph Bunche's son won't have any trouble at all when he applies for membership in another fashionable white club.

What else does "integration" mean under the capitalist system? More of the steady festering of self-hatred, the erosion of ethnic self-pride, hair-straightening processes, *Ebony* magazine, black deb parties, *The Nadinola Mind*. White liberals are already writing that the Afro-Americans *also* have to do "their share" in the fight for integration by becoming "better"—meaning by becoming even more conventionally middle-class white in attitude and behavior than they already are.

Ralph Bunche at the UN apologizing to the murderers of Lumumba is the symbol of capitalist integration—he is the goal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

incarnate. And even that goal cannot become a possibility for the bulk of the black masses until someone develops the Instant All Purpose Permanent White Skin & Mind Bleach.

BUT if integration means a *functioning, egalitarian, multi-racial society,* then there is no real integration in America, anywhere. Except possibly a strained and partial glimpse of it in certain underground communities, like the Beats and the Gay World. And of course among the Puerto Ricans in New York (where, however, color lines strengthen after a short while on the "mainland").

I submit that real integration can only occur in America if there is a socialist revolution. Only then will there be an (armed) state power that will systematically and intuitively *seek out* and abolish all visible aspects of race discrimination, and develop a social and educational system that will eventually eliminate those invisible aspects that are so fundamental to the present American culture. (The Black Muslims understand this when they charge that Judeo-Christianity is a white man's religion.)

III

It may be fifteen, twenty, thirty years before such a Revolution will occur in America. But the Afro-American masses are already militant and they are moving into a crisis stage in their demand for social justice. They are not simply the most potentially revolutionary sector of American life today—they are the *only* potentially revolutionary sector. The gulf in revolutionary potential that separates the races is so vast that so long as the goal at this time of heightening crisis remains that of "integration" (capitalist or socialist), the typical white worker is more likely to respond as a racist at the sight of black militancy than as a fellow worker.

Given this situation, are we then capable—for reasons of our own Marxist understanding—of asking the restless black masses to be "moderate," to slow down, to *wait* until a sizable segment of white America reaches an equivalent revolutionary potential? This sort of logic-trap is a precise illustration of the constant Black Nationalist charge that the white Left must inevitably betray the interests of Afro-Americans.

If the white Left can comprehend that the goal of integration under American capitalism is based on a liberal, not a socialist, perspective of our society's future and revise its position accordingly, then all of this struggle may not lead as it now must to a series of useless compromises with the white Establishment.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Preposterous as they may sound to our delicate white, leftist egos, the aims of Black Nationalism—geographic, economic, and cultural autonomy, "a divorce with a property settlement"—are nevertheless so obviously more viable as a political goal today, or five years from today, than that of an American socialist revolution.

Failure to revise our position will mean to continue to hail every erosive token, compromise, and betrayal as "progress." I don't believe in "progress." It's a faulty, crippling concept of time that we inherited from capitalist thought. I believe in Changes. And Changes happen when individuals or classes make some sort of personal or group revolution. The Afro-Americans are approaching such a moment in their destiny. If the white Left continues to insist that the immediate goal of black liberation should be integration instead of separation, we will earn our name in American history as advance "left" agents of counter-revolution.

With much of what Marc Schleifer says, it seems to us, every socialist must wholeheartedly agree. The United States today *is* an ugly place to live in; within the framework of *this* society, the goal of integration in the sense of genuine equality is fantastically unrealistic. This is, to its innermost core, a society of exploitation, inequality, privilege. The Negro was originally brought here in chains to occupy the lowest rung in the ladder of the agricultural South. As the country became urbanized, he moved to the cities where he occupies the same rock-bottom position. His predecessors in this hell-hole of American life—white immigrants from Ireland, French Canada, Southern and Eastern Europe—have all been able to escape by climbing up the ladder, even if only a rung or two for the mass, to the highest rungs for a few. Only the Negro, branded a pariah by his skin color, has been "kept in his place,' which is now quite literally the urban ghetto. He is exploited to one degree or another by *all* who occupy higher positions on the ladder. With

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quantitatively unimportant exceptions, they *all* compensate for their feelings of inferiority and envy toward those above them by feelings of superiority and contempt for the Negro beneath them. A society constructed like this one has a profound need, both material and psychological in nature, for a helot class to do its dirtiest and most menial work and to act as a receptacle for its accumulating frustrations and hatreds. Negroes form that class; there are no other candidates in sight; they are quite literally irreplaceable.

Under these circumstances, Schleifer is a thousand times right when he says that the struggle for integration inevitably turns into a struggle for the right of Ralph Bunche's son to join a fashionable white club. Not immediately, to be sure. In the South there are still the infamous Jim Crow laws and customs. There the struggle for integration is above all a struggle to abolish Jim Crow. But in the North, and probably soon in the South as well, integration can only mean the entry of a tiny minority of well-to-do blacks into the anterooms of the white Establishment.

The black masses either understand this or are rapidily learning it. Before our very eyes, the character of the struggle is undergoing profound changes, even in the South where "integration" necessarily remains the first item on the agenda. Economic demands are coming to the fore, demands for jobs and more and better housing. And the tide of black nationalism is running strong.

What is "black nationalism"? In Schleifer's words, "wanting to give the whole thing up." In our figure of speech, escaping from the hell-hole not by climbing the ladder but by jumping off and going elsewhere. Where? Some say back to Africa. The Black Muslims, undoubtedly the largest and fastest growing nationalist group, demand that the white government of the United States should set aside territory for a black nation and pay appropriate indemnity for past damages—the arrangement which Schleifer refers to as "divorce with a property settlement."

Schleifer asks: Can anyone blame Negroes for wanting out? Of course not. But does that mean, as he finally concludes, that we socialists, white and black, should insist that "the immediate goal of black liberation . . . should be separation"?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It seems to us that there is a grave confusion here. Some Negroes want up, others want out. Some socialists, most notably the Communist Party, enthusiastically support the former. Schleifer says we should support the latter. But is it really the function of socialists to do either?

We think not. It cannot be overemphasized that no one, but no one, is going to tell the Negro movement what its goal is. It is not a ladies' club or a temperance society. It has many organizations but no organization. It has hundreds of leaders but no leader. It is one of those awe-inspiring, elemental, spontaneous movements involving millions of human beings which history throws up from time to time. Such a movement forges its weapons and defines its goals *in practice*—through experience and struggle. For anyone, socialist or liberal or reactionary, to tell it what its goal is or what it ought to be is at best naive and at worst intolerably arrogant.

What, then, is the task and role of socialists? First, of course, to participate in the struggle, not on their own terms but on terms set by the Negro movement itself. This necessarily means different things to different people in different places. The movement has many facets, many methods, many problems, and it is these which will determine the particular modes of participation. But among whites it is not only socialists who will give support to the movement. Some whites will participate because they are moved by the inherent justice of Negro grievances and demands; others, especially among the growing army of the unemployed, because they understand or at least sense that their own troubles stem from the same basic roots as those of Negroes.

Socialists, we think, have additional and very important responsibilities. We have already said that they cannot tell the movement what its goals are or should be, but they *can* help the movement to find out for itself. And the way to do this is through studying the historic situation as a whole, both domestic and international; through analyzing past and current experience; through separating real possibilities from false hopes; through educating people, black and white, to understand their problems and to tackle them in a rational and purposeful way.

Already, certain things are clear to us, as they are to Marc

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Schleifer and, we hope, to many other socialists.* The hope of any meaningful form of integration within the framework of this exploitative and thoroughly corrupt society is illusory. Believing this, we must say it and attempt to prove it to the best of our ability—a task to which we of MONTHLY REVIEW expect to return again and again in the period ahead, deepening our analysis of the position and role of Negroes in U.S. society and making use of new evidence as it becomes available. But this does not mean that we feel entitled to denounce those sections of the Negro movement which have integration as their goal, still less that we should presume to prescribe for them some other goal. The truth is that we too, and we believe all socialists who are really worthy of the name, believe unreservedly in the goal of integration. But we also believe that it can be achieved only by a thorough-going social revolution.

Does this mean, as some whites appear to believe, that we ought to ask the black masses to moderate their demands until enough whites are ready to join them in making a revolution? On the contrary, it seems perfectly elementary to us that only through pressing their demands for "integration now" and finding out how pitifully little they can achieve will Negroes become convinced of the necessity for revolution. Masses of people learn from struggle and experience. In this sense, Negroes have enrolled in a cram course for the indefinite future. Should we socialists, of all people, be the ones to advise them to drop out? As to whites, they will be involved in the Negroes' struggle willy nilly, and it promises to be a school for them too. What they will learn is a subject which, so far as we are aware, has not yet even begun to be explored. Our hunch, however, is that the same process that makes Negro revolutionaries is going to make a lot of white revolutionaries too. And in any case, isn't it the clear duty of socialists to do their best to make it so?

* It would be agreeable to be able to assume that they are clear to all socialists, but, alas, it is all too evident that this is not so. If one can judge from the article by James Jackson entitled "A Fighting People Forging New Unity" which appeared in *The Worker* of July 7th, the Communist Party understands very little except how to repeat cliches, glorify the bourgeois leaders in the Negro movement, and heap slander on the heads of other Negro leaders, including the Black Muslims and Robert F. Williams.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ah, but wait a minute, Marc Schleifer in effect says to us. It is true that integration now is an illusory goal, but so is revolution now. And Negroes are not in a mood to wait. Indeed, a growing number of them are already espousing a quite different goal—complete separation of the races. This, in Schleifer's view, is much more realistic than integration or revolution. Let us therefore also espouse it.

We have no desire or intention to quarrel over the goal of separation. We understand well enough why many Negroes want it, and it is certainly not our business to tell them they should want something different. But it *is* our business to analyze the demand for separation with a view to finding out whether it is attainable and, so far as possible, what it would be like. Here we shall confine attention to the first issue, its attainability. Schleifer doesn't actually say that it can be attained, now or in the next five years, but he gives the impression that he thinks the chances are favorable. But are they?

We think not, for precisely the same reasons that we think integration into the present social structure is unattainable. Not only the members of the ruling class in the narrow sense but large segments of the middle and working classes have a profound vested interest in the continued existence of an urban Negro sub-proletariat. These are by all odds the decisive elements of what is increasingly referred to in the Negro movement as the white power structure. This power structure is not going to permit the Negro to escape from the ghetto by rising, and it is just as little interested in seeing him escape by going elsewhere. It wants to keep him precisely where he is, and it will make concessions such as illegalizing the Jim Crow system and letting Ralph Bunche's son into a white club only to the extent that it judges them useful to the main purpose in hand. Donating land and money to set up a separate Negro republic most emphatically does not come under this heading.

Why is it that many Negroes—and, if Schleifer's views are at all symptomatic, apparently an increasing number of whites —can see the unrealistic nature of the goal of integration into this society and yet can regard separation as attainable? The reason, we suggest, is that they have never probed to the roots of the problem. The black nationalist's reasoning is essentially

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

simple: he knows that he is treated abominably by whites and assumes that such behavior can only result from profound feelings of hostility and hatred. He also knows that anyone he hates he doesn't want around. Reasoning by analogy, he therefore concludes that whites should be glad to get rid of Negroes. All Negroes have to do, then, is organize appropriately and negotiate the terms of a divorce by mutual consent.

The trouble with this deceptively logical argument is that it misses the point. Though there are of course exceptions, it can be said in general that whites, even the extreme white supremacists of the South, do not hate Negroes as such. They feel superior to Negroes, which is a different thing. This feeling of superiority in turn leads to different attitudes toward Negroes: tolerance or even liking for those who "know their place," resentment and hatred for those who claim equality. Now, these feelings and attitudes are not God-given natural attributes of the white race; they had their origin in early modern times in the need to rationalize and justify the enslavement and exploitation by white Europeans of colored peoples all over the world. They have continued to be the psychological and ideological counterpart of that exploitation right down to and including today. Hatred of Negroes by whites is essentially hatred of any and every attempt by Negroes to escape this exploitative relationship: it signifies not that whites want to get rid of Negroes but that they want them to accept the status of an inferior and exploited class, not that they want to release Negroes from their prison but that they want to lock them ever more securely in. Failing to understand this, black nationalism holds out to the Negro masses a hope of salvation which is fully as illusory as the hope of salvation through integration in which they are rapidly losing faith. One can go further and say that in one crucial respect the black nationalist perspective is even less realistic than the integrationist: the integrationists at least know that progress can be achieved only through struggle; the nationalists, for all their seeming toughness and intransigence, pin their faith on the voluntary acquiescence of the "white devils."

Before he gets to his plea that socialists support the goals of black nationalism, Marc Schleifer says: "I submit that real

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

integration can only occur in America if there is a socialist revolution." We think all genuine socialists must agree. We also think that more and more Negroes, and eventually the decisive sectors of the Negro movement, will agree. Not, of course, because we tell them so but because their own experience will tell them so. In the meantime, it is surely our main job to help them to interpret that experience correctly, to distill from it reliable knowledge, and to learn how to use the knowledge to achieve what is after all the ultimate aim of all the downtrodden of the earth—to lead an existence worthy of human beings.

One final point: if our perspective is right, we are just at the beginning of a prolonged struggle which is bound to go through many stages and phases. It is a sheer illusion to expect decisive results in the near future, just as it is utopian to demand them. But it is not only the Negro movement which will undergo change and development; the American Left is at the beginning of a similar process. And as both Negroes and leftists learn from the unfolding struggle, the two movements can and should come increasingly close together. White socialists, who have certainly not escaped the molding influence of the society they live in—Marc Schleifer's phrase "our delicate white, leftist egos" is all too *à propos*—should understand the implications of such a development: Negroes are going increasingly to assume the leadership of the U.S. Left. They are, as Schleifer rightly says, the only potentially revolutionary sector of American life today, and they are gaining invaluable experience in what seems merely to be a race struggle but is in reality a class struggle—the struggle of the most oppressed and submerged class in American society for elementary social justice and human dignity. They are earning the right to lead a new American Left which can play an honorable role in bringing the era of capitalist exploitation and imperialism to a close. We are convinced that nothing can prevent them from asserting that right—and we have no hesitation in adding, the sooner the better.

(August 5, 1963)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEGRO PROBLEM IN THE U. S.— AN OUTSIDER'S VIEW

BY KEITH BUCHANAN

As the author explains in the opening paragraph of this article, he was moved to write it not by a study of the Negro problem in the United States but by a study of the problems of the Third World. He was, he tells us, struck by similarities suddenly thrown into sharp relief by the Birmingham crisis. It is probably safe to assume that what he has written is an explicit formulation of ideas which have occurred to many people, both inside and outside the United States, as they have watched the dramatic development of the Negro struggle in recent months.

As readers of MR know, we are in general agreement with Mr. Buchanan's position. Nevertheless, we think that his angle of vision—comparing U.S. Negroes with the exploited peoples of the colonies—has led him into two errors which are at the same time instructive and in need of correction.

First, Mr. Buchanan holds that what the peoples of the underdeveloped lands have been and are to the advanced countries of Europe, the Negroes are to the United States. We recognize that there is truth in this formulation; what is wrong with it is that it denies, or at least diverts attention from, the fact that the United States is now sitting on top of the biggest empire the world has ever known and is fatefully involved with the peoples of the underdeveloped lands to a far greater extent than any of the European countries. The Negro problem is not simply the form which the colonial problem takes in the United States; it is *additional* to and it derives its transcendental importance from the fact that the two are intricately and dialectically interrelated.

Second, Mr. Buchanan is impressed by the evidence of recent history that the motor force, even if not the directing hand, of revolutions in the underdeveloped countries comes from the peasantry. His comparison between the peoples of these countries and the Negroes in the United States leads him to assume that a similar situation must exist here. Since most Negroes engaged in agriculture are in the South, he tends to localize the Negro problem in that area and in his final paragraph he asks whether "the Muslims of the American South" may not prove to be, along with the peasants of the underdeveloped countries, a decisive force for change in the capitalist world. Clearly, Mr. Buchanan has got things badly out of focus here. Ever since the First World War, Negroes have been migrating from the Southern countryside to the cities, both North and South. By now, they are by a large majority an urban people, and those left on the farms are the aged, the handicapped, the less ambitious. All the revolutionary energy of Negroes is concentrated in the cities, and it is there, especially in the North, that black nationalism, of which the Muslims are the leading exponents, has its strength. The lesson is plain: the colonial analogy must be used with great caution. After all, the United States is not an underdeveloped country and it is quite impossible for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any group living in it to occupy a position which is really similar to that of the peasantry in a backward and dependent society. The Negro problem in the United States is in many respects unique, and neither its true nature nor its surpassing importance can be understood unless this fact is frankly recognized.

Keith Buchanan is Professor of Geography at Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand. He has written for MR before, most recently the article "The Demolition Men: The U.S. and the Crisis of Neutrality in Southeast Asia," in the February, 1963, issue.—The Editors

Whilst working on a study of the Third World, and concerned especially with the relationships between the working class of the developed Western countries and the colonial and ex-colonial peoples who make up the great mass of the Third World's population, the writer heard a radio report on the jailing of a thousand Negroes in Alabama. Although geographically half a world removed from these events, and although his first-hand knowledge of the United States is limited to a quarter's teaching as visiting professor at a Mid-Western university, he could not help being struck by the similarities between the problem on which he was working and what may at first sight appear to be a very different and purely internal problem of American life, similarities suddenly thrown into sharp relief by the Birmingham arrests. The remarks which follow are intended to focus attention on some of these similarities and to pose certain questions. To these questions, which are central to the whole problem of world socialism, the writer does not claim to be able to offer any definitive answer.

I'm All Right, Jack!

In any study of the underdeveloped world, and more especially of future development within that world, we must ultimately confront the problem of the relationship of the left-wing movements of Europe (or, in a more general sense, the "white" world) to the past exploitation of the non-European masses and to the prolongation of this exploitation through the more sophisticated techniques of neo-colonialism. We must concern ourselves greatly with the adequacy or otherwise of Marxist theories regarding the role of the urban proletariat as an agency of revolutionary change; and we must concern ourselves both with the proletariat of the developed countries in its rela-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions with the underdeveloped world, and with the proletariat within the various sectors of this underdeveloped world.

The widening gulf which separates the affluent nations and the proletarian nations is perhaps the strongest indictment of the failure of the European working classes and their leaders to live up to the ideals of global socialist solidarity. The gulf between rich and poor nations is, of course, nothing new; for over a generation the world situation has been characterized by the juxtaposition of affluent metropolitan countries and hungering and stagnating dependent territories. Over this generation the working classes in the West have progressively pushed up their level of living, and certainly there can be little criticism of their determination to emerge from the often subhuman conditions under which so many millions were formerly condemned to live and die. What is harrowing and what is crucial here is that, in part at least, this rising level of living should have been achieved at the cost of the worker in the non-Western world;[1] that, having tasted the delights of affluence, the workers should have become ever more bourgeois and Europo-centric in their attitudes. In Britain, MacMillan's claim that "you've never had it so good" and the working-class attitude enshrined in the phrase "I'm all right, Jack!" express succinctly the means and the result of the alienation of the western masses.

With some honorable exceptions, the record of the political leaders of the Left in Europe has, in the context of world socialism, been one of defection and treason, resounding phrases and empty gestures. Preoccupied with the redistribution of wealth within their own countries (with "the sharing of the booty" as the French socialist Marcel Péju puts it)[2] they have collaborated with the governing classes in a token embellishment of the ghettos of the Third World, but have never dreamed of showing their solidarity with the workers who live in those ghettos by formulating measures to redistribute wealth on a global scale. The assertion of an anonymous Algerian, that the European Left, and especially the French Left, has failed in its duty as far as the colonial peoples are concerned,[3] echoes almost forty years later Ho Chi Minh's statement, made in

* Notes will be found at the end of the article.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1924, that "our party [the French Communist Party] has done very little for the colonial peoples." And the inescapable verdict is pronounced by an Italian socialist: "The revolutions in the Third World have exposed the impotence of the European Left at every level."[4]

And since the Western proletariat has shown no great revolutionary ardor as far as the non-European masses are concerned, since the leaders of the European Left have shown little awareness or little responsibility in the desperate struggle of the non-European peoples to assert their humanity, this assertion has had to be made with the machete and the machine gun, and in the face of the indifference or the opposition of the Western working classes.[5] Vietnam and Cuba; Cyprus, Kenya, and Algeria; Angola and South Africa—all these steps forward in the progressive assertion of their humanity by "the damned of the earth" have been made by the peoples of the proletarian nations taking the initiative into their own hands and "going it on their own."

Algeria to Alabama

The indifference to the colonial problem, the impotence of the Western Left as an agency of change in the exploitative relationships which have existed between the peoples of Europe and the peoples of the dependent and formerly dependent territories, appears to find a counterpart in the ineffectiveness of the American Left when confronted by the Negro question.

The traditional view of the situation appears to be that the problem of the Negro in American society can be solved only with the solving of the problems confronting the American working class as a whole. As Richard Greenleaf puts it: "The exploitation of the American Negro is but a refinement and extension of capitalism's exploitation of the American worker. The best way to end the first is to end the second."[6] This appears to reflect Marx's attitude to the Jewish problem in Europe: the emancipation of the Jews would be contemporaneous with the emancipation of the bourgeoisie. It echoes the thesis of Rosa Luxembourg that the emancipation of the oppressed peoples was essentially subordinate to the emancipation of the proletariat:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

changes in the structure—and outlook—of the dominant European society were thus regarded as fundamental for change in the situation of either minority groups or oppressed colonial peoples.

There is a growing volume of evidence to suggest that this traditional view is in need of drastic modification to fit the facts of the situation in the Third World or in the American South. The need for such a rethinking of the situation has been most forcefully expressed by Harold W. Cruse who stresses the thesis that "the changes that have taken place both in the structures and relationships of Western capitalism and the underdeveloped world have rendered nineteenth century Marxian concepts obsolete."[7] Cruse argues, and it is a viewpoint adopted by many other non-European workers in this field, that the "class struggle" is no longer a reality between capitalists and proletarians within the Western and affluent nations, but has become supranational—in the last resort, a struggle between the "have" and "have-not" peoples. As far as the United States is concerned, the critical element in the situation is that the Negro group, while not a "nation" in the formal sense, is in every sense a "national minority." As long as the Afro-American is not integrated politically, socially, or economically, Negro nationalism will emerge; and this nationalism, in order to achieve federal action designed to raise the economic and social status of the Negro, "may be forced to demand the right of political separation."[8] This will drive home the reality that the Negro problem in the United States is a problem of underdevelopment; that the relationship between the Afro-American and the dominant culture of the United States is the relationship of a depressed and exploited colonized group to its colonial overlord; and that, while geographic distance isolated the European colonial power and European peoples from the problems of *their* dependent peoples, the United States, like the South African Republic, has *its* colonial problem within its own frontiers.

The failure of the American Left to recognize the implications of this colonial quality of the Negro problem, to profit from the lessons which might have been drawn from the national liberation movements in the colonial world overseas,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

above all, to confront the fundamental issues posed by the fact that the West's colonies achieved liberty before the triumph of the socialist revolution in the metropolitan countries—these failures help to explain the inadequacy of its policies and the undermining of its prestige. And, just as in the West the failure of the parties of the Left to measure up to, or even to understand, the issues posed by the struggle of the colonial peoples meant that they have been left far in the rear by the revolutionary movements in the Third World, so, too, do the doubts and confusions of the American Left on the same issues (but posed within their country) carry the same prospect that they, too, will be left behind by a surge of black nationalism.

Negro Nationalism and a "Non-national Bourgeoisie"

In his study of the black bourgeoisie, E. Franklin Frazier, the Negro sociologist, came to the view that the group lacked "the economic basis that would give it roots in the world of reality." Cruse describes it as "distorted and stunted . . . a backward bourgeoisie." Under these conditions, the role it has been able to play in hastening along the social or political advance of the Negro group has been minimal. The achievement of integration becomes increasingly a means to achieving bourgeois goals, and especially to increasing the social and occupational advantages accruing to the integrated group, while the liberation of the Negro working class becomes purely incidental.[9] The fact that the bourgeois reform wing of the Negro movement (the NAACP and the like) has set itself only limited goals has not prevented the American Left from supporting this tendency. Unfortunately, the slow and uneven pace of advance toward even these limited objectives tends to discredit this gradualist approach and to push the Afro-American masses towards more radical types of solution to their problems. In this context the South African situation is very relevant: the limited achievements of the moderate African National Congress have led to an increasing alignment of Africans behind the more extreme and nationalistic Pan-African movement. Black nationalism of various types is thus tending to attract an increasing adherence in the United States among the Negro working class; the essentially middle-class, middle-of-the-road

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

views, and the assimilationist ideology of the Negro intellectuals and bourgeoisie, are increasingly rejected. And since the American Left has tended to align itself with these Negro middle-class aspirations and largely to ignore the nationalist component in the Negro movement in the United States, the Negro working class turns increasingly to these Nationalist movements, rather than to the left-wing parties of white America, whether Marxist or otherwise.

In consequence, just as the European Left is having to come to terms with various national revolutionary or radical movements in the Third World—movements whose nationalist, non-Western content it either failed to recognize or underestimated—so, too, a similar reappraisal must face the "white" left-wing parties in the United States. And, while the policies or attitudes of groups such as the Black Muslims contain much that is unreal and much that is disturbing, they cannot be written off as irrelevant; indeed, Alan Albert can claim that "the Black Muslims represent the emotional aspirations of three-quarters of the American Negroes."[10] Surely Cruse's statement that "those on the American Left who support revolutionary nationalism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, must also accept the validity of Negro nationalism in the United States,"[11] is one that poses fairly and squarely the nature of the challenge?

A Bigger Cake—And Bigger Crumbs

There is, then, a striking parallel between the impotence of the European Left confronted with the revolutionary upheavals in the Third World and the incapacity of the American Left to confront effectively the Negro problem in the United States. Moreover, though widely separated in space and time and though differing in detail, the processes of social change which have resulted in this parallelism are very similar, and in both the role of the bourgeoisie is critical. The bourgeoisie in the underdeveloped countries was in large measure a creation of the colonial power. It had little economic autonomy, but insofar as it developed, it did so within the limits allowed it by the dominant society. Its character and function have been very different from that of the classical bourgeoisie of Western Europe which initiated the process of capital accumulation, laid the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foundation of modern industry and commerce and gave their nation at least a minimum of prosperity—things the colonial bourgeoisie never achieved. It has been a phantom group, aping in its values the metropolitan bourgeoisie, turning its back on and perhaps despising the peasant masses who make up the great proportion of the population. Given the Europo-centric quality of elite culture, and given the assimilationist ideals of its leaders, this colonial bourgeoisie has been incapable of developing an original and authentic culture; economically, socially, culturally, its role has been at best negative, at worst parasitic and destructive.

These criticisms apply equally to the Afro-American bourgeoisie which is the equivalent of the national bourgeoisie created by the white man in the colonies; it was created for the ultimate benefit of the white man; it protects him from the masses and from the emergence of revolutionary tendencies in these masses by offering the prospect that they, too, may perhaps share in the economic cake, if only to the extent of a few crumbs. Its collaboration—and through it the collaboration of the masses—can be encouraged by inculcating the idea that it is in its interests to make the cake bigger, for then *their* share of the crumbs will be bigger. And, of course, it fulfills a critical function by taking on itself, unawares, part of the hate which those exploited have for those who exploit them.[12]

By adopting a policy of leaning on these middle groups, which have become increasingly alienated from the peasant masses and the working classes, the parties of the European and American Left have themselves become alienated from the great forces of change which are beginning to transform the non-white societies of the world. The rejection of these European-oriented elites has been most decisively expressed by the Algerian writer Frantz Fanon who castigates them as "a bourgeois bourgeoisie, meanly, stupidly, cynically bourgeois. . . . It is necessary to oppose it because it is useless. This bourgeoisie, mediocre in its gains, in its achievements, in its thought, tends to mask this mediocrity by prestige achievements at the individual level, by the chrome of American cars, by Riviera holidays, by weekends in neon-lit night clubs."[13] It is expressed by the Jamaican rejection of the "Black Man Judas," the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Negro "who has stepped into the imperialist master's shoes and taken on his most wicked attributes."[14] It is expressed by inference, since the American Negro bourgeoisie has tended to assimilate to the white system of values, by the Black Muslims' rejection of white society which, in their view, "is sick, immoral, dishonest, and filled with hate for non-whites."[15] And, until the American and European Left recognize the violence of this rejection of the hypocrisies and cruelties of the white man, and the rejection of all groups who, in one way or another, attempt to assimilate white ideas and concepts of life, it can play no meaningful role in the struggle for emergence of depressed colonial populations or repressed and colored minorities. If such a recognition is to be attained—and the hour is already far advanced—the Left must abandon "the unending dialogue it has been carrying on with itself" and must lend an ear to the message of writers and fighters such as Frantz Fanon, to the new voices which are making themselves heard through the length and breadth of the Third World, *and* in the heart of America, among the Negro masses *who represent an extension of this Third World.*

The Damned of the Earth

The rejection of the colonial bourgeoisie (and of the Negro bourgeoisie) as a significant agent of social change in the underdeveloped areas implies a re-examination of the whole question of the nature of the radical or revolutionary forces in backward societies. It can, for example, be argued that the trade unions and the proletariat, no less than the colonial bourgeoisie, are themselves merely an artificial extension of one aspect of the metropolitan and colonizing society;[16] as such, their efficacy as agents of change is reduced. Certainly, in many parts of the Third World their members enjoy a relatively favored position within their own societies and, in contrast to the "classical" proletariat of the West, have everything to lose and nothing to gain from struggle or upheaval; they tend, under these conditions to be cautious, non-violent, and given to compromise: this is demonstrably true in many African states.

Fanon advances the view—and it is a view which receives a strong measure of support from the recent history of China,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cuba, or Algeria—that the peasantry is the most decisive force for change in an underdeveloped society. Hungry, exploited, his old social position eroded, the peasant has nothing to lose and everything to gain from the destruction of the society which oppresses him. He discovers, and discovers rapidly, that violence, and violence alone, pays off; for him, there is no possibility of compromise or negotiated agreement. In China and Vietnam, in Cuba, in Kenya and Algeria, in Brazil's Northeast, in the back country of Angola, the peasantry emerges as the decisive driving force in revolutionary struggles. It has even been implied by some writers that Lenin was beginning to define a system of revolutionary dynamics based on the peasantry.[17] The present writer is insufficiently acquainted with Lenin's thought to judge the accuracy of this claim; nevertheless, the events of recent years, the fact that the Third World's population is largely a peasant population, and the strong rural component in Afro-American society suggest that Fanon's emphasis on the revolutionary role of "the damned of the earth" merits much more than merely cursory attention or perfunctory dismissal as "revolutionary romanticism"; it may well prove to be of decisive importance in the elaboration of a more effective left-wing approach to the problems of non-white societies.

Finally, the emergence of left-wing regimes and radical political movements in many parts of the underdeveloped world, and the apparent nationalistic and radical trend in the underdeveloped region of the American South seem to be inverting the classical left-wing theory by which social revolution in the advanced countries would make it possible to lift the burden of oppression in the dependent territories. The increasing determination of "the damned of the earth" to have done with exploitation and to take upon themselves the task of refashioning their societies in such a way that hunger and oppression are banished—these developments will have profound repercussions on the economic structure of the highly developed countries. Indeed, they may well provide the conditions in which a drastic restructuring of our own affluent societies in both America and Europe will be essential. We can close by posing the question: "Will, in the last analysis, the Pan-Africanists of South Africa, the *fellagha* of Algeria, the guerrillas of Vietnam, and the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Muslims of the American South prove a more decisive factor for change within the capitalist world than all the left-wing parties combined?" Two years ago, even six months ago, the writer would never have dreamed of posing the question; today its relevance seems increasingly obvious.

NOTES

1. Pierre Moussa, *The Underprivileged Nations, London,* 1962, pp. 6-7.
2. Marcel Péju, "Mourir pour de Gaulle? in *Les Temps Modernes,* Oct.-Nov. 1960, p. 499.
3. Un militant algérien, "La gauche européenne et l'avenir de l'Afrique" in *Partisans,* No. 5, 1962, p. 124.
4. Daghini, cited in *Partisans,* No. 6, 1962, p. 9.
5. Illustrated by French acceptance of the Algerian policy of the Socialist leader Guy Mollet—"the colonial-socialist hysteria" as one French writer puts it.
6. Richard Greenleaf, "Studies on the Right?" in *Studies on the Left,* Vol. III, No. 1, 1962, p. 57.
7. Harold W. Cruse, "Reply" in *Studies on the Left,* Vol. III, No. 1, 1962, p. 61.
8. Harold W. Cruse, "Revolutionary Nationalism and the Afro-American" in *Studies on the Left,* Vol. II, No. 3, 1962, p. 24.
9. *Cf.* the opinion of a colored newspaper editor to a white man: "The white people draw the line at the wrong point and put all of us in the same class." Quoted by E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro Family in the United States,* New York, 1948, p. 326.
10. Alan Albert, "Une nouvelle génération de Noirs aux U.S.A." in *Partisans,* No. 8, 1963, p. 71.
11. "Revolutionary Nationalism and the Afro-American," *loc. cit.,* p. 24.
12. Alan Albert, *op. cit.,* pp. 69-70.
13. Frantz Fanon, *Les damnés de la terre,* Paris, 1961, pp. 114, 132.
14. Katrin Norris, *Jamaica,* London, 1962, p. 63.
15. Harold W. Cruse, "Revolutionary Nationalism and the Afro-American," *op. cit.,* p. 25.
16. Robert Paris, "Sur un premier bilan du 'fanonisme'" in *Partisans,* No. 8, 1963, p. 184.
17. Cf. Robert Paris, *op. cit.,* p. 179.

The Negro in America is not a part of the American society. This is the greatest single crime that the American people have ever committed, and one of the greatest crimes that any people have ever committed.

—*Robert M. Hutchins, The Political Animal*

General and complete disarmament must presuppose complete and total liquidation of colonialism.

—*Dr. Nkrumah*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LESSONS OF THE PHILIPPINE GUERRILLA WAR

BY WILLIAM J. POMEROY

In the eyes of United States military strategists, the campaign against the Huk movement in the Philippines during the 1950's is supposed to provide a classic example of successful anti-guerrilla warfare. Wherever United States training programs are in operation, the alleged crushing of the Huks is used as a model of counter-revolutionary methods.

While it is undeniable that the Huk movement suffered a military defeat, the nature of the struggle, its proportions, and its consequences have been exaggerated and distorted to suit the needs of American policy. It is the purpose of this article to help set the record straight and to point up some of the lessons of the Philippine experience for other national liberation movements.

The Huk movement had its origin in the armed struggle against Japan (Hukbalahap means National Anti-Japanese Army). At the end of the war, however, it shifted to legal forms of parliamentary and economic struggle and would doubtless have continued along this road if it had not been for the savage campaign of repression launched against it by the Philippine government—a campaign which was initiated because the Huks stood as the main barrier to the re-imposition of colonial relations on the newly independent nation.

It was only in January of 1950, after three and a half years of suppression and developing resistance, that the Huks (by then the name had been changed to the Army of National Liberation, or HMB) finally called for the overthrow of an imperialist-puppet regime which had closed the door to all legal forms of political activity. It was only at this stage that the Huks passed

---

The author played an active role in the Philippine Huk movement, was captured in battle in 1952, and served ten years of a life sentence for "rebellion" in a Philippine prison before release through pardon. A book on his experiences, *The Forest,* will be published by International Publishers in the near future.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over from tactics of defense and reconciliation to tactics of offense, of full-fledged armed struggle.

Imperialist spokesmen have claimed that the Huk armed struggle was defeated by a mixture of force and attraction, by a combination of measures of military suppression and of political and economic reform. The assumption is that the same policies can suppress national liberation movements elsewhere.

This assumption is false even if based upon the Philippine experience itself. While it is true that the HMB was decimated and defeated militarily, the causes were much more complex than the Pentagon theorists of anti-guerrilla warfare recognize. Furthermore, the consequences of the armed struggle and of the nature of the measures taken to suppress it have been far-reaching in the Philippines and have contributed greatly to the weakening of imperialist domination of that country.

Reforms, whether agrarian or political, although much publicized during the administration of Ramon Magsaysay, were superficial and almost wholly of a propaganda nature; they had little if any effect on the lives of the peasantry, whose conditions have progressively worsened rather than improved. A minimizing of fraud and terror in elections did occur, but the political parties remained in the hands of landlord, church, and comprador interests.

The setback given to the Huk movement was almost wholly due to ruthless military suppression, carried out with vast quantities of United States military aid, by an army equipped and trained by an American military advisory group. Even this, however, would have been ineffective but for deficiencies within the Huk movement itself and in its conduct of the struggle.

That the Huk movement in the Philippines failed to achieve the successes of its brother liberation movements in other areas was due in large part to serious tactical errors and errors of estimate by the Huk leadership at the beginning of 1950. That the situation called for an armed struggle of an insurrectionary nature at that point is beyond debate. However, a cardinal principle in a struggle of this kind—that of a protracted war—was neglected in favor of a relatively rapid progression toward seizure of power, with the illusion of achieving a relatively quick

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

victory. Phases of legal struggle that were still possible and steps toward the creation of a broad united front of a nationalist character that could bring into play the discontent of diverse forces that were ready for change but not for direct participation in armed struggle, were neglected in favor of a rapid build-up of Huk armed forces. The prospect of a long and difficult struggle was not posed before the movement and its rank-and-file adherents, who were left unprepared for the demands of endurance later placed upon them.

To a great extent, this error can be traced to the comparative isolation of the Philippine national liberation movement, also a factor not taken sufficiently into account by Huk leaders. Only one or two its cadres had ever been outside of the Philippines; none had ever been in a position to share the experiences and lessons of other struggles in other countries. The Huks had no liaison of any kind, howsoever slight, with any force, party, or ally outside of the archipelago. The isolation was so great and the movement was so much on its own that not a single theoretical work by any Marxist or non-Marxist authority on guerrilla struggle or armed revolutionary struggle was in its possession; the theories of Mao Tse-tung on the protracted war and its elements had scarcely been heard of and played no part in deliberations on strategy and tactics.

In October, 1950, the Huk movement suffered its most serious blow with the arrest of its entire top leading organ, in the city of Manila, and, at the same time, the seizure of the movement's files that exposed to suppressive agencies the Huk tactical plans, estimates, disposition of forces, cadre lists and their assignments, sources of supply, contacts, and other relevant information. The effect of this, with the consequent problem of replacing an entire leadership, was the loss of initiative by the Huks at a time of a developing offensive. It was a good illustration of Marx's dictum that "the defensive is the death of every armed rising." This setback was not due to the skill or strength at the time of imperialist forces, but to the overconfidence, carelessness, and faulty security measures of the national liberation movement, which attempted to maintain its leading organ in a location where it was least able to protect it. The arrest, even then, was due only to the opportunist surrender of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the head of a Huk armed unit in Manila who informed on his comrades for money, and not to the ingenuity of military intelligence. While losses of this type are a feature of most liberation struggles (the capture of Ben Bella and his fellow leaders during the Algerian War, and the near-fatal losses to the Castro party on its return to Cuba in 1956 are other examples), in no case could it have been so easily avoided nor did it have such disastrous effects as in the Philippines.

In addition to these theoretical and organizational defects, it must be noted that neither in the military forces of the Huk nor in the Philippine Communist Party did there exist one cadre with anything approaching a grasp of overall military theory or of the elements of strategy and tactics affecting the Philippine situation. The lack of military leadership was equalled by the quality of arms in the hands of the Huks and of the guerrilla technology known to them. Except for a handful of machine guns seldom used, the weapon of heaviest caliber was the Browning Automatic Rifle; the mortar, any type of explosive and its use, or even the grenade were all absent from Huk equipment and knowledge. The Huks possessed no radios, no communications equipment of any kind, no means of transportation. No technician of skill was in the ranks of the movement; it did not even have a doctor. Its peasant and worker members were armed chiefly with courage. No aid of any kind, whether in the form of arms, funds, or training facilities, was available from outside the Philippines, where the struggle was conducted in complete isolation from allies or sympathizers from abroad.

Despite these circumstances, a government army of 54,000 men, plus an air force and a navy, plus an equal number of "civilian guards" and other auxiliaries, were kept in the field against the Huks for a decade or more, during which an estimated two billion pesos were expended for military suppression by the American and Philippine governments.

This is the "model" of suppression that American anti-guerrilla theorists utilize in training counter-revolutionary "special forces" in the United States Army and in its adjuncts in Latin America and in Asia. It is a grave error to believe that what happened in the Philippines can be duplicated in any other situation where every shortcoming of the Huk struggle has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been foreseen and avoided or overcome. The Huk movement suffered its setbacks, in the main, because of its own tactical faults; they were due less to the strength and policies of the forces of suppression. *Wherever a national liberation movement has adopted the correct tactics and made use correctly of the forces at its disposal, it has triumphed and won freedom and independence for its people.*

In the Philippines itself, in spite of the claims of the Philippine army and of the Joint U.S. Military Advisory Group (JUSMAG) that trained, equipped, and directed that army, the Huk movement has not actually been destroyed, and the subsiding of the armed struggle after 1955 was due in part to a shift of tactics by the movement, which finally recognized the necessity for a protracted struggle and for a combination of armed struggle and legal tactics. During 1962, sixteen years after the beginning of the anti-Huk campaigns in the Philippines, military authorities estimated that 300 Huks were still actually in arms and that the movement was in a state of resurgence. In the province of Pampanga alone, twenty-six commanders were reported leading guerrilla units, and provincial authorities claimed in October, 1962, that virtually every *barrio* and its officials in the province supported and aided the Huks. Reports of encounters between Huks and government troops and of the liquidation of government spies by Huks appear regularly in the Manila press.

The effects of the armed struggle in the Philippines upon American imperialist control of this area have gone far beyond the creation of an indestructible national liberation force. In 1950, at the height of the Huk offensive, emergency measures were adopted at the behest of American aid missions to shore up a deteriorating Philippine economy. The deterioration was due largely to the operation of the unequal "free trade" agreement, imposed by the Americans at the time of independence and opposed by the Huks, and would not have been considered such an emergency in the absence of an expanding armed liberation struggle. Strict economic controls were resorted to, cutting imports drastically and restricting remittance of profits by foreign investors. The unplanned result of these measures was the growth and entrenchment of a Filipino manufacturing and industrial

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class that provided the base for a broad bourgeois nationalist force that came inevitably into collision with American interests. This complemented, although it has as yet not merged with, the national liberation movement based in the peasantry and workers. Together, however, these anti-imperialist forces have disrupted, to a considerable extent, postwar imperialist designs in the Philippines and have begun the dissolution of colonial relations. The long Huk struggle, therefore, has nourished a broad rebirth of nationalism among Filipinos, has contributed to the breakdown of old patterns of colonial economic and political control, and has augmented the conditions of imperialist instability in the Philippines.

In conclusion, there is every reason to believe that the Philippine national liberation movement has learned valuable lessons from its experiences, can overcome its setbacks, and will move into the next phases of its struggle prepared for every demand that necessity makes upon it, including that of armed struggle.

On trips to Asia I often asked men in their thirties and forties what they were reading when they were eighteen. They usually answered "Karl Marx"; and when I asked them why, they replied, "We were under colonial rule, seeking a way out. We wanted our independence. To get it we had to make revolution. The only books on revolution were published by the Communists." These men almost invariably had repudiated colonialism as a political cult, retaining, however, a tinge of socialism. As I talked with them, I came to realize the great opportunities we missed when we became preoccupied in fighting communism with bombs and with dollars, rather than with ideas of revolution, of freedom, of justice.

—Justice William O. Douglas, The U. S. and Revolution

Today America is no longer the inspirer and leader of the World Revolution. . . . By contrast, America is today the leader of a world-wide anti-revolutionary movement in defence of vested interests. She now stands for what Rome stood for. Rome consistently supported the rich against the poor in all foreign communities that fell under her sway; and, since the poor, so far, have always and everywhere been far more numerous than the rich, Rome's policy made for inequality, for injustice, and for the least happiness of the greatest number. America's decision to adopt Rome's role has been deliberate, if I have gauged it right.

—Arnold J. Toynbee, America and the World Revolution

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LATIN AMERICAN ECONOMIC INTEGRATION

BY ANDREW GUNDER FRANK

Recent years have witnessed the birth and development of two Latin American free trade zones, one in South America and one in Central America. Any superficial resemblance these may have to the European Common Market should not lead us to expect the current steps toward economic integration in Latin America to reproduce the European results. Even apart from the fact that a free trade zone is a much weaker form of integration than a common market, the circumstances in Latin America are quite different, especially as regards the area's low degree of economic development and high degree of imperialist economic dependence.

For the time being, there is virtually no intra-regional trade in South America, to say nothing of Central America. Therefore, the most important, if not only, significance of a free trade zone, customs union, or similar arrangement is the creation of a potential market large enough to attract and justify investment in Latin American industrialization. The free trade zone is thus defended by many of its proponents, who recall Adam Smith's dictum that the division of labor depends on the extent of the market. But history shows that the extent of the market, in turn, depends less on its territorial extension than on the income of its consumers. Hence increasing the breadth rather than the depth of the market is at best only a minor step in the right direction and at worst, as will be argued here, a premature step which will impede the larger and more necessary step. What is really needed is to solve the problem of poverty and low productivity, especially in agriculture. Even if we leave aside for the moment the human needs and welfare of the people and consider only

---

Andrew Gunder Frank is teaching sociology and economics at the new University of Brasilia in Brazil. His last article in MR was "The Varieties of Land Reform" in the April, 1963, issue.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effective demand and supply in the industrial sector, history still provides ample evidence for the primary importance of solving the problem of agriculture. The successful industrialization of Western Europe was evidently dependent on the revolution in European agriculture as well as, of course, on the colonization of the now underdeveloped continents of the world. But the priority of depth over breadth of the market, of solving the problem of agricultural productivity, is attested to equally by the failure to date of attempts to industrialize such countries as Brazil and Mexico. Brazil already has a market of continental proportions. It has built in Sao Paulo the largest industrial complex in Latin America. But having failed even to attack its agricultural problem, notoriously one of the world's most serious, Brazil remains a very underdeveloped and non-industrialized country. Mexico, whose revolution 50 years ago produced what was before Cuba the most far-reaching agricultural reform in Latin America, stopped her land reform short and failed to release large parts of the potential productivity and energy of her rural people. As a result, Mexico's industrialization and economic development drive has also stopped short. The truth is that to foster industry and economic development, Latin America must transform its agriculture; and to do that it must in turn radically alter its entire internal and external political, economic, and social structure. Economic integration, specially integration of the present economic structures of its various countries with each other, will not solve the problem.

What, then, *will* integration do—and what will it prevent? It will, notwithstanding "provisions" to the contrary, attract capital to the centers that are already most industrialized and not to those that are least so. Indeed, to the extent that the capital will come from inside Latin America, integration will draw capital out of the poorer and into the richer regions, just as has already happened in the development of Brazil. It will widen also the gap between country and city, and it will certainly not benefit the large mass of peasants. It will, in short, make the rich richer and the poor poorer, relatively, certainly, and absolutely as well, if Latin American developments in the past ten years, even without a common market, are any guide. The thesis that a free market equalizes incomes, or even prices,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among its sectors is a myth that was invented by the rich while they were exploiting the poor.

Nor is this all. Given the present economic structure of Latin America, local capital is scarce; given the present political structure, foreign capital is "welcome." The industrial capital that the economic integration is supposed to attract would therefore in large part, and in Central America obviously almost wholly, have to come from abroad, especially the United States. But the principal aim of investment capital is of course to benefit the investors. And it does. According to U.S. Department of Commerce calculations, during the 1950's the total amount of money sent from Latin America to the United States as "earnings" on U.S. investments in the region was double the value of the investments. Latin American calculations show an even higher rate of return. For example, the Joint Brazil-U.S. Economic Commission estimated that withdrawals to the United States between 1939 and 1952 came to 61 (yes, sixty-one) times the amount of long-term investment. Thus economic integration of Latin America under present circumstances will not only draw capital from the poor to the rich in Latin America itself. It will also make the poor Latin Americans poorer and the rich North Americans richer.

Matters are still worse. Economic integration carries with it special privileges for firms inside the integrated region. They receive tariff protection, often tax and credit privileges, and in Central America virtually total monopoly positions. In many if not all cases the quality of their products will be poorer and their prices higher than those of comparable imported goods. The Latin American consumer will therefore lose by the arrangement. Such short-term losses from infant-industry protection are justified and even welcome if the sacrifices involved will bring or at least contribute to long-term benefits. But, as we have already seen, the long-term effects of integration in Latin America are likely to be unfavorable. Thus current steps toward integration involve short-term sacrifices to be followed by greater long-term sacrifices.

The truth is that countries which have successfully industrialized in the past have done so without foreign investment and "aid." Outstanding examples are Japan and the Soviet

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union, not to speak of the countries of Western Europe. The countries that have been the recipients of heavy foreign investment have remained non-industrialized and underdeveloped. The only apparent exceptions are the United States, the British Dominions, and Israel. But in all these cases foreign immigration accompanied the foreign capital, and all the benefits went to the immigrants and none to the natives. The exceptions thus seem to prove the rule. It will be interesting to see if foreign aid to a *socialist* country, such as Yugoslavia, Cuba, or Eastern Europe, will result in economic development. It has been suggested that, because a socialist country can control its economy and thus can channel the aid into development-producing industrial projects, foreign capital can aid a socialist country to develop where it fails to do so in a capitalist country. If this argument is well taken, then economic integration will also benefit Latin America only if it comes *after* the respective countries' conversion to socialism, and not before.

If Latin American economic integration will not make a positive contribution, will it serve to *prevent* economic development? The political implications of the move to integration suggest that it will, to the extent that it proceeds before rather than after fundamental change. The United States used to oppose the Latin American Free Trade Zone project. The Kennedy administration is supporting it. Why? U.S. involvement in Latin America used to be based principally on the client relation maintained with the commercial bourgeoisie in each country, which latter maintains a similar client relation with its own landowning class. This triple alliance long served the interests of all the partners and permitted the U.S. to follow a divide-and-rule policy in which it maintained a bilateral relation with each country separately. Integration threatened the stability of this arrangement. Now, underlying economic, social, and political developments are increasingly threatening the stability of this form of alliance anyway. The growth of national, mostly light, industry and the concomitant development of a national industrial bourgeoisie in some countries, along with a relative shift of interest of American capital from extractive to secondary and tertiary industries in Latin America have altered the economic relations. This, along with social mobility and the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

growth of middle classes, which have become the pivots of the electoral process, as well as the declining relative power of the landowner, have changed national political alignments. For these reasons, American policy, as the Alliance for Progress makes amply clear, has been to shift its reliance away from the "feudal" landowner toward strengthening of ties with the newer groups interested in maintaining the status quo. Economic integration measures strengthen the hand of these new groups relative to that of the landowners while tying (through American investment and "aid") these groups increasingly to the United States. At the same time, of course, integration opens the doors to that same American investment in secondary and tertiary industry. Above all, in the context of a continent in flux, the Latin American Free Trade Zone contributes to political stability. It strengthens existing groups, excepting the "feudals," and creates others with an interest in preserving the status quo. Thus, the Free Trade Zone has, from the American point of view, become desirable: the more successful this project, the less desirable and necessary are alliances with military dictators like Trujillo, Duvalier, and Stroessner. Less desirable because their very dictatorial power affords them, domestically, a certain degree of independence from U.S. management; and less necessary because the political weight of the new domestic forces created by integration affords political stability and an opportunity for the U.S. to play one group off against another. "Divide and rule" no longer operates by dividing one country from another as much as by dividing one class and interest group from another. But U.S. domination remains the same.

If economic integration contributes to class division, will it also in the long run contribute to progress by increasing class struggle? To the extent that integration does foster industry even if not industrialization, it adds to the growth of the industrial working class. That class, it might be argued, will then ultimately destroy the alliance which keeps Latin America underdeveloped. The evidence in Latin America so far, however, is that industrial workers, especially organized industrial workers, far from being a progressive force, have been a conservative element. They too have been a relatively privileged group, an aristocracy of the proletariat, which derives its privileges from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the present economic structure and thus has an interest in preserving it. Except in special cases, only the peasants in Latin America have a large and independent revolutionary potential. And economic integration will indeed intensify their exploitation. Thus, in the last as in the first analysis, it is in destroying the existing agricultural structure, and not in integrating the present industrial structure, that the key to Latin America's future lies. Only that step can and will lead to genuine industrialization.

MR PRESS

PAMPHLET PACKET $4

Why Socialism? by Albert Einstein	20¢
Principles of Communism by Engels (trans. by Paul M. Sweezy)	25¢
Socialism Is the Only Answer by Huberman and Sweezy	35¢
Marxian Socialism; and Power Elite or Ruling Class? by Sweezy	35¢
The Theory of U. S. Foreign Policy by Sweezy and Huberman	35¢
Reflections on the Cuban Revolution by Paul A. Baran	50¢
The ABC of Socialism by Huberman and May	50¢
Economic Development, Planning, and International Cooperation by Oskar Lange	50¢
British Guiana by Ved Prakash Vatuk	50¢
The War in Vietnam by Hugh Deane	50¢
The Split In The Capitalist World and In The Socialist World by Sweezy and Huberman	50¢
Latin America and the Alliance for Progress by Alonso Aguilar	50¢
Total	$5.00

PAMPHLET PACKET SPECIAL

All the above pamphlets $4

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Diogenes Searches U.S.A. For An Honest Newspaper

Bertrand Russell, nonagenarian British war resister, has been trying to tell the people of the United States that their government is guilty of using poisonous chemicals in its Vietnam War. As a channel for this information, Russell chose the *New York Times*. His resulting frustrations are described in a letter to *I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly* of July 22, 1963:

"When I originally raised this point in my letter to the *New York Times,* the *New York Times* attacked me editorially for failing to provide evidence. In my reply to this attack I devoted five paragraphs to specific documentation with regard to the chemicals used. The *New York Times* published my letter, omitting all the particular references to chemicals. . . .

"The U.S. Government has been charged by the South Vietnam Liberation Red Cross . . . with using weed killers which, in the large doses used, are harmful; with using white arsenic, various kinds of arsenic sodium and arsenite calcium, lead manganese arsenates, D.N.P. and D.N.C. (which caused leaves, flowers and fruits to fall, killed big cattle like buffaloes and cows, and seriously affected thousands of the inhabitants of South Vietnam; with having spread these poisonous chemicals on large and densely populated areas of South Vietnam.

"Admittedly, the South Vietnam Liberation Red Cross is, as its name suggests, allied with those opposing the U.S. supported Diem regime, but its published findings cannot be ignored since it has urged international investigation of the situation. The use of these weapons, napalm bombs and chemicals, constitutes and results in atrocities.

"The editor of the *New York Times,* in reply to a private protest of mine about this, stated that the reason that my evidence on chemical warfare was not published was because it was known all along to the *New York Times!*

"The *New York Times* of January 19, 1962, stated that of 2600 villages in Vietnam, nearly 1400 had been destroyed be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause of military action by the U.S. and the Diem Government. I should be grateful if you would allow me to make these facts known to the American public."

Signed: Bertrand Russell

We are glad to help publicize Mr. Russell's charges. We know, from personal experience, how difficult it is to reach the people of the United States with anything stronger than the soothing syrup which fills the chinks between advertisements in most U.S.A. newspapers and magazines. We also remember a similar controversy which raged a dozen years ago when the United States armed forces were charged with using chemical and bacterial agents in the Korean War.

There is a growing body of evidence which supports the South Vietnam Liberation Red Cross charges. Hugh Deane's *The War in Vietnam* (Monthly Review pamphlet No. 23, Monthly Review Press, 333 Sixth Ave., New York 14, 50 cents) and Wilfred G. Burchett's *The Furtive War: The United States in Vietnam and Laos* (International Publishers, 381 Park Avenue South, New York, $3.95) both provide background and detailed evidence of the outrageous methods that are being employed by the United States armed forces in their desperate efforts to win a war which the French lost on the same battleground in 1954.

From Friendly Assistance to Hot War

United States armed units are now doing routine combat duty in the atrocious Vietnam War. An Associated Press dispatch published on July 26, 1963, reported that American helicopters "have started taking a full combat role in the war against the Communist guerrillas. . . . Flights by these Americans in the Mekong River delta are accounting for a mounting number of guerrillas.

"When these high-fire-power helicopter units first arrived in Vietnam from the United States late last year they were restricted to firing at guerrillas only when shot at. Last March the American command in Saigon told pilots they could fire first, but only when Communist ground-fire endangered a transport helicopter assault mission. Missions flown by helicopters in recent weeks go far beyond those limits.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"On Monday five helicopters flew in to aid the trapped ranger battalion even though no transport helicopters were being used. They fired 25,000 machine gun rounds and 140 rockets. . . . The Viet Cong pulled out, leaving 113 bodies, Vietnamese military officers claim." (Bangor *Daily News,* July 26, 1963)

War in Vietnam is planned, financed, equipped, and fought under the direction of the Washington government. Admittedly, a majority of the Vietnamese people are opposed to the highly unpopular Diem government. Admittedly, if United States support were withdrawn the Diem government would be overthrown by the Viet Cong. Admittedly, and in violation of the United Nations' charter, Washington is employing war as an instrument in furtherance of its anti-communist policies. Admittedly, the hit-and-run jungle war may go on for years. The war lasted eight years before the French quit fighting and pulled out of the same area in 1954.

Cash and Violence in British Guiana

British Guiana's socialist government is under attack from within and without. Internal enemies, including the United Force (representing Guianese business interests and the political opposition led by Forbes Burnham) carried on an eleven-week general strike that ended July 6, 1963. The strike was accompanied by well-organized arson, looting, and murder, on a nationwide scale.

The general strike never involved more than a minority of Guianese workers, but it seriously crippled the economy, resulting in food and fuel oil shortages and hampering domestic and international transport and trade. Its motivation was frankly political. Leaders of the opposition insisted that the strike would be continued until the Jagan government was driven out of office.

Behind the general strike, financially, were important forces outside of Guiana. Cash support estimated at $30,000 per week was sent into Guiana during the strike through the AFL-CIO connections of the Guianese Trade Union Congress. The exact source of the funds has not been determined, but the money came from some point in the United States.

Cheddi Jagan, whose People's Progressive Party has won three consecutive elections against bitter opposition from Guian-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ese business interests, has put "Independence for Guiana" at the top of his list of political objectives. As Prime Minister of the first socialist government in Latin America (Jagan won his first election in 1953) Cheddi Jagan has met with London's stubborn refusal to grant independence to its Guianese Crown Colony. Recent evidence indicates that strong Washington pressures are being brought to bear on London to persist in this refusal. The *New York Times* of July 9, 1963, reported that "the U.S. is urging Britain to suspend the Constitution in British Guiana and to impose direct (British) rule in the riot-torn colony." The *New York Times* correspondent wrote that Washington is strongly opposed to independence for British Guiana "while Dr. Jagan is in power." The correspondent added that during President Kennedy's recent visit to London he was assured by Prime Minister MacMillan that independence for British Guiana "was not contemplated."

Through the turbulent weeks of the general strike the 600,000 people of British Guiana had to live on inadequate food supplies with curtailed public utilities. Prime Minister Jagan, as Chief of State, was responsible for ensuring the general welfare. Dr. Jagan made an urgent plea to Washington for emergency aid. He was turned down. From Cuba he was able to get shipments of food and fuel oil.

Three years earlier, Dr. Castro, Prime Minister of the other socialist Latin American government, went through the same enlightening experience. Aid for Cuba was refused by the capitalists and was provided by the socialists.

The *New York Times* of July 30, 1963, carried a further item: British Guiana has granted landing rights to Cuban aircraft on a reciprocal basis. Georgetown asserts that this move furthers the Guianese policy of facilitating internal travel and that similar terms are being offered Surinam, Venezuela, Trinidad, and Jamacia. Washington sees the move as "a new outlet for Cuban subversive penetration of South America in defiance of the United States policy of isolating Cuba."

The *Times* report ends with this significant paragraph: "The Importation Department of British Guiana's government held a reception at Georgetown, the colony's capital, last Friday to celebrate the tenth anniversary of Premier Fidel Castro's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolutionary organization."

Dr. Jagan, a moderate socialist, who believes in securing socialism through constitutional methods, is being forced by London and Washington pressures into the socialist camp. Both Prime Minister MacMillan and President Kennedy pay lip service to law and order under democratic procedures, but when it comes to a crucial issue and the cards are against them, they throw law, order, and democratic processes to the winds and draw a gun.

There are still important groups in Latin America who believe that necessary changes can be made through electoral procedures. Guianese events are undermining their faith.

Aggressing Against Cuba

President Kennedy stated his Cuba position in his answer to a press conference question on April 24, 1963: "I know there's a good deal of concern in the United States because Castro is still there as Prime Minister of Cuba. I think it's unfortunate that he was permitted to assume control in the nineteen-fifties. . . . We have—the OAS—have almost diplomatically isolated Castro in this hemisphere. . . . We've been working through the Alliance for Progress to prevent a repetition of the Cuba incident. . . . Now we're coming down to the question . . . if the United States should go to war in order to remove Castro. We don't—. That nettle is not grasped. It would seem to me that we have pretty much done all those things that can be done to demonstrate our hostility to the concept of a Soviet satellite in the Caribbean except take these very steps—these other steps which bring in their wake violence and may bring a good deal of worldwide difficulty."

These words came directly from the President. They describe his attitude and his hesitation, before a decision that might involve a general war. If those steps involve the infringement of Cuban sovereignty and the wrecking of the Cuban economy, so much the worse for Cuba. If those steps should lead to a general war. . . . In April 1963 the President was still hesitating. Meanwhile, Washington takes those steps, short of war, which will hogtie Cuba economically and isolate and cripple Cuba politically.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Peace on Earth

It may sound ironical to turn from hot war in Vietnam and Laos and tepid war in British Guiana and Cuba in order to discuss "Peace on Earth." But "Peace on Earth" was the title chosen by the late Pope John XXIII for one of his last official acts: a pronouncement on the dangers of war and the possibilities of peace. This papal pronouncement argues the case for the recognition of human dignity, the need for world order maintained by a duly constituted world community and world authority.

Part IV of the Encyclical is headed: "Relationship of Men and of Political Communities with the World Community." "At this historical moment," Pope John wrote, "the present system of organization and the way its principle of authority operates on a world basis no longer correspond to the objective requirements of the universal common good."

Recent developments have resulted in a high degree of interdependence on a planetary level. "Just as within each political community the relations between individuals, families, intermediate associates and public authority are governed by the principle of subsidiarity, so too the relations between the public authority of each political community and the public authority of the world community must be regulated in the light of the same principle. This means that the public authority of the world community must tackle and solve problems of an economic, social, political and cultural character which are posed by the universal common good. For, because of the vastness, complexity and urgency of those problems the individual States are not in a position to tackle them with any hope of a positive solution." (Official Vatical translation of "Pacem in Terris.")

The urgent need for world government has seldom been more simply and directly stated.

Part V of the Encyclical urges all men of good will to take common action for peace and the general welfare. This plea is directed alike to Catholics and non-Catholics. If it is heeded and acted upon in time the human race has a chance to survive on the planet Earth.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

SOUTH AFRICA'S UNDERGROUND

BY "SOUTH AFRICAN"

Julius Lewin's essays (*Politics and Law in South Africa,* Monthly Review Press, 115 p.) were written between 1953 and 1960, before the Sharpeville massacre of 1960 and the resulting ban on the African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan African Congress (PAC) diverted the resistance movement against white supremacy into illegal and violent channels. Events have overtaken him in significant aspects of his survey.

His essays are models of good journalism. Factual and analytical, written in simple and vigorous language, they give a deeper insight than many more pretentious volumes into the underlying causes of the struggle in South Africa. His basic analysis of power relations remains unshaken by later developments. But he wrote in a climate quite unlike the prevailing one, and his essays appear curiously out of focus. One feels that he would present the material in a different way, with a different emphasis of light and shade, if he were to traverse the same ground from the vantage point of 1963.

His comments on the form of the struggle inevitably arouse the reader's keenest interest. He wrote in 1953 that Congress was the only alternative to terrorism; in 1956 that physical violence was unlikely except from limited groups who would be suppressed, that there was no means of effective resistance to oppression by the powerful and ruthless government, and that Africans had still to learn how to use nonviolent pressures effectively; in 1958 that passive resistance could be ruled out, big strikes were unlikely and could not succeed, and change by means of a revolutionary upheaval would not occur in the foreseeable future. The government commanded enough power to suppress any uprising.

The author is a distinguished South African intellectual who must remain anonymous for obvious reasons.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These propositions may be as true today as when Lewin wrote; but they would seem remote and almost irrelevant to members of the underground resistance movement. They want action, not political lectures; and their whole being is centered on finding and exploiting weaknesses in the government's security system. Men in this state of mind do not ask whether revolution is or is not "around the corner." Their aim is to keep the flame of resistance burning bright and clear for all to see, to force the government onto the defensive, and to inspire the oppressed people with a will to revolt. How far they have succeeded in their endeavors may be gauged from the following resumé of events in the past six months.

The number of South Africans who have been indicted under a Sabotage Act passed in 1962 has risen to 2,994. Sentences ranging from 12 to 25 years' imprisonment, and two death sentences, have been imposed on persons convicted of conspiring to assassinate a government tribal chief, attacking police stations, throwing bombs into policemen's houses, attempted derailment of trains, and cutting electric cables. Cases of sabotage in which the perpetrators have not been apprehended include the firing of sugar plantations in Natal, the bombing and burning of pass offices, derailments, and the wrecking by bomb explosion of ministerial offices in the Union Buildings, where the administration is seated.

The police attribute the sabotage to an organization operating under the name of *Umkhonto We Sizwe* (Spear of the Nation) and associate it with the ANC underground. Less sophisticated acts of violence, including the killing of whites, are blamed on Poqo, which came into prominence after the Paarl riots of November, 1962, when a band of Africans marched for six miles from their segregated shanty town to attack a police station in the early hours of the morning. They killed two white civilians and injured others. The police shot and admit to killing six Africans, but the actual number of deaths is probably much bigger. Four hundred and fifty Africans were detained in connection with the disturbances; 18 have already been sentenced to 12 years each, and other cases are pending.

The Paarl upheaval shocked the country and produced the effects of a minor Sharpeville. The government claims that Poqo members are responsible for the riots and for the subsequent killing of whites in the Eastern Cape. Poqo is a Xhosa word meaning "completely, entirely," and was used in the last century by a religious sect which refused to have anything to do with whites. According to the government's version, Poqo is just another name for the banned Pan African Congress, but the courts have re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jected this contention. There is no proof, they say, that Poqo is an organization, and still less evidence that it is the same organization as the PAC.

The police raided African homes throughout the country in March and April under the pretense of looking for Poqo members, and arrested between 1,500 and 2,000 people. More than 850 cases are pending against them. They are being charged with murder, attempted murder, sabotage, or the illegal possession of arms, but most will be tried for belonging to an illegal organization under a new law which is being rushed through parliament at the time of writing (April, 1963).

A despotic government such as we have here cannot operate under normal controls. It must create one crisis after another to renew its energies, divert attention from its own misdeeds, justify its brutality, consolidate its following, out-maneuver the official opposition, rally the white oligarchy, and subdue the revolting blacks. Its ideal condition is one of war. The Nationalists are building a military apparatus which takes on more and more the character of an occupying army in conquered territory. The defense budget for 1963-1964 is R148 million; it was R44 million in 1960-1961.* White youths are conscripted for military training; adult whites are being mobilized in police reserves and home guards. The judicial process has been abrogated in political cases.

Lewin points out that since white supremacy is incompatible with the rule of law, the government must eventually jettison the rule of law. The General Laws Amendment Bill does just that. With the support of the Opposition (only Mrs. Helen Suzman, the solitary Progressive Party member in the House, voted against) the government has presented the bill as a necessary instrument to cope with a venomous, unscrupulous underground movement which obtains guidance and technical training from revolutionary circles in Europe, Asia, and North Africa. What the bill does, however, is to deliver, not only freedom fighters, but all radical opponents of the regime into the hands of the police without fear of interference from the courts.

Political prisoners who have served their sentences can be kept in prison for an unlimited period under order of the Minister if he declares them to be a danger to the state, which means in practice the Nationalist Party. One reason for the indecent haste with which the bill is being enacted is that Robert Sobukwe, the president of the banned PAC, is due to be discharged from prison on May 5th after having served a three-year sentence for leading the anti-pass campaign in 1960.

Another reason is the desire to convict and jail hundreds of

* The South African currency unit is the rand=$1.40.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Poqo members against whom no offense can be proved. The Bill allows the executive to declare that any body or movement is a continuation of a banned organization. This declaration can be made to operate retrospectively to April, 1960, and will enable the prosecution to indict Poqo members for belonging to the unlawful PAC.

The courts' attempts to whittle down despotic ministerial powers are being frustrated by another provision. Under the notorious "house arrest" clause, the Minister can restrict a person to any "place," which the bill defines as including "any premises, building, dwelling, flat, room, office, shop, structure, vessel or vehicle, and any part of a place." The purpose of the amendment is to prevent the courts from granting relief to radicals who, without being charged with an offense, are being imprisoned in their own homes at their own expense.

Forty-six Africans, charged with leaving South Africa illegally, were recently sentenced to two years, the maximum prescribed for the offense. The prosecution alleged that they had gone abroad to receive military and political training in independent African states. The new bill equates such conduct with treason, and makes it punishable by hanging. The courts may pass the death sentence, or alternatively must impose a minimum sentence of five years on persons convicted of (a) advocating, outside the Republic, forcible intervention by a foreign government or institution (such as the United Nations) to bring about social change in South Africa; or (b) undergoing training or acquiring information outside the Republic which could be of use in furthering the aims of an unlawful organization. A presumption of guilt arises in the latter case which the accused must discharge by proving his innocence.

Denial of bail, the holding of summary trials in prison, and tampering with the mail by post office and prison officials are other things that the bill will make possible. Its main technical purpose, however, is to enable the police to pounce on political suspects and keep them incommunicado for 90 days at a stretch for "questioning." Lawyers, relatives, and others have no right of access to the prisoners, and the courts have no jurisdiction to order their release. Our rebels are undergoing torture in police cells today; the new law will make torture a regular feature of the judicial process.

Lewin's sober and balanced account hardly prepares the reader for these shocking developments, but it does help us to understand their root causes. He traces them to economic exploitation, racial prejudice, and rival nationalisms. Afrikaners form 60 percent of the white population. Their numerical predominance among the whites

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

explains the rise of the Nationalist Party.

It has an impregnable position as long as it maintains four conditions: (a) only whites have the vote; (b) Afrikaners remain a majority of the electorate; (c) the Nationalist Party obtains the support of the great bulk of Afrikaner voters; and (d) the English-speaking whites do not enter into an alliance with the disfranchised blacks.

The English, says Lewin, have surrendered their political heritage for a portfolio of gold shares. A minority group, they could not anyway achieve power without allies. But they immersed themselves in making money, and allowed Afrikaners to take possession of the commanding heights in the political structure. Sharing the spoils obtained from exploiting the blacks, the English are not prepared to break through the color barrier and establish a united front with the disfranchised majority. Now that they have lost political power, however, the English are likely also to lose economic power. Afrikaners are using their control of the state apparatus to oust the English from their dominant position in commerce, finance, and industry.

This leaves the 12 million Africans, Colored, and Indians as the only source of effective resistance. The handful of white Communists who share their struggle make an important contribution in the form of political education, but cannot acquire a mass following. African nationalism challenges Afrikaner nationalism; and it has come of age. It no longer needs whites to speak for it, nor rests content with the second grade citizenship that liberals of an earlier period held out as its goal. Africans want nothing less than complete equality, the right to live as free people, and the opportunity to join the rest of their continent in the march towards the realization of an African personality. Yet—and here we return to the note struck in the opening passages of this review-article—"it would be foolish to imagine that Africans are in a position to emancipate themselves shortly."

This picture of combatants locked in a fixed and seemingly unchanging grapple omits some of the dynamic elements. The situation is more fluid than Lewin suggests. For one thing, the Nationalist government is less rigid than he implies. For the reasons he gives, it is adamant in its refusal to extend political rights to Africans; but it concedes that it cannot dominate them by force for all time. Verwoerd's solution, which he is imposing on his party against some resistance, is to open safety valves by promoting "self-government" in the reserves, which constitute 13 percent of the country's surface area and contain less than half of the African population. Lewin does not discuss this program, and thinks that the gov-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernment's benevolence toward tribalism is nothing more than a rationalization of racial discrimination and subjection. But there is more to it than this. The Nationalists hope to divert the explosive forces of African nationalism into a network of isolated tribal channels. Deep-seated and irreconcilable contradictions in the policy must defeat the aim, but anything that is done to modernize the reserves will undermine tribalism, strengthen the proletarian and middle-class leadership, radicalize the peasants, and create new focal points of resistance to white domination.

Another omission is the impact that pressure from abroad makes on South Africa. Lewin is fully alive to the strength of the movement against colonialism and radicalism in the world at large but is inclined to discount it as a force in South African affairs. The more astute Nationalist leaders do not hold this view. They are aware that external pressures are likely to multiply in proportion to the strength of the underground. Whites have the physical means to massacre the entire African population, but will the world stand by while the slaughter continues?

As resistance grows, so will the government resort to increasingly brutal methods of oppression which, in turn, will set off chain reactions here and abroad.

Look at the political map of Africa. See how the tide of emancipation from colonialism has spread through the continent since Ghana achieved self-rule in 1956. Watch the tide's sweep into East Africa and southwards through Central Africa. Note how it is engulfing Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia, and now laps on the shores of Southern Rhodesia. Africa, at least, will never rest until its black sons and daughters in the South have been freed from the curse of racial humiliation and political slavery. Colonialism may well make its last stand in the Republic, but here too does the bell toll for white supremacy.

In conclusion, I want to pay a tribute to the distinguished author of these essays. Julius Lewin is eminent in many fields, as academic thinker and teacher, free-roving journalist, social reformer, and fearless critic of the repellent aspects of South African racialism. His outspoken but always well-informed articles and lectures have often drawn fire from top-ranking government men, but he has never faltered. He is a radical in the best tradition; one who combines a deep and passionate faith in the common man with an intense hatred of tyranny. Yet he has never allowed his feelings to deflect his judgment or distort his vision of reality. There are few South Africans as competent as he to interpret and explain the tortuous windings of our national tragedy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DRAPER REFUTED

BY WILLIAM LEISS

The events of April, 1961, will be forgotten by Latin Americans only if the future holds in store still greater tragedies for the nations of the Americas. Abandoning the well-tried tactics of CIA subterfuge, the United States Government attempted to overthrow the government of another sovereign nation—what was formerly called "imperialism" was now described as a defense of "hemispheric solidarity." The basic facts about our complicity in the Bay of Pigs invasion are not disputed. But the ideological debate continues.

As a prologue to invasion the State Department issued a White Paper on Cuba. Written by the historian - turned - propagandist Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., this document stated a thesis that had become part of the official rhetoric of American liberalism: "The leaders of the revolutionary regime betrayed their own revolution, delivered that revolution into the hands of powers alien to the hemisphere, and transformed it into an instrument employed with calculated effect to suppress the rekindled hopes of the Cuban people for democracy and to intervene in the internal affairs of other American Republics." This theme forms the basis of the controversy between radicals and liberals on the issue of Cuba and Cuban-American relations. In order to understand this controversy it is necessary to look at its general background.

On the great social issues which confront Latin America today there can be no rational discussion between radicals and conservatives. The latter are devoted to the maintenance of the status quo—Army, Church, *latifundia;* the former see hopes of substantial improvement only in the destruction of the power of those institutions. Both understand that widespread violent struggle is inevitable in the coming decades and that its outcome will determine the form of future society. But liberals also claim to be interested in this matter and to offer another alternative to the solutions of radicals and conservatives.

Not revolution, but reform; not radical transformation, but gradual evolution: this is liberalism's answer. Agrarian reform (the breaking up of large estates into individually-owned plots, with compensation to the owners), parliamentary democracy, "free elections," promotion of foreign investment, encour-

---

William Leiss is a doctoral candidate in the History of Ideas program at Brandeis University. This review is reprinted, by permission, from *The Justice,* the student newspaper at Brandeis.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agement of local capitalist industry. And the Colossus of the North, converted by liberalism from malevolence to benevolence, will gently encourage all those who play the game according to its rules with an "Alliance for Progress." For the liberals, the Latin American problem is no more difficult to solve than that of urban redevelopment, for example, in this country. No bloodshed, no violence, not even bad feelings: with a little friendly persuasion the neo-feudal institutions will realize their errors and slowly pass away. Then the peoples of the southern hemisphere will enjoy with their northern benefactors the sweet balm of freedom.

Can liberals really bring the charge of utopianism against radicals? What is more utopian than this view of reality? What is more ahistorical? There is no example in all of history in which a major set of institutions has willingly surrendered its power. Nor is it possible for nations to repeat the historical pattern of development of a bygone era. And if liberals would critically examine their notion of "freedom," they would perhaps discover the shoddiness of their ideal: its purely *political* connotation, its individualistic basis, its false claims to be a panacea for deep-rooted social ills. As C. Wright Mills wrote: "To the world's range of enormous problems, liberalism responds with its verbal fetish of 'Freedom' plus a shifting series of opportunistic reactions." Yet it is precisely this utopian scheme that lies behind the charges of "betrayal' which liberals, led by Theodore Draper, have hurled at Castro's government.

William Appleman Williams' book* is an attempt to answer those charges. Mr. Williams is Professor of American History at the University of Wisconsin and the author of several scholarly and controversial books in his field, notably *The Contours of American History*. His book on Cuba is issued by an independent socialist publishing firm —Monthly Review Press—and on that account will probably be overwhelmingly ignored by the American reading public. (A companion volume is J. P. Morray's *The Second Revolution in Cuba*.) With this book Mr. Williams can lay claim to the mantle of C. Wright Mills as one who is both a recognized scholar and an intellectual leader of American radicalism. His work combines original insight, a fine historical sense, acute analysis, and good writing; it is the best refutation of the liberal position now available.

Williams urges that the Cuban Revolution can only be understood as "the product of a dynamic inter-relationship between three primary factors. . . . One of these major factors is defined by the interaction be-

* *The United States, Cuba, and Castro,* by William Appleman Williams, Monthly Review Press, 1962, $3.25.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tween Castro's commitment to the Constitution of 1940 . . . and the United States. A second is defined by the similar and concurrent interaction between Castro's commitment to the Constitution of 1940 and the other elements that formed the anti-Batista coalition in July, 1958. The third major element is the on-going economic crisis that had started in the last year (or 18 months) of Batista's rule, and for the origins of which Castro bears absolutely no responsibility." His analysis of the Cuban Constitution of 1940 completely undermines the liberal argument.

Draper and others base their charge of betrayal on Castro's supposed violation of his initial promises and intentions. According to them, Castro promised merely to restore the orderly processes of liberal democracy to Cuba; specifically, this meant implementing the provisions of the 1940 Constitution, a long (over 300 articles) and noble document which had never been honored. The much-needed agrarian reform was to involve no more than dividing the huge estates into plots owned by the peasantry. Most importantly, Castro was to hold "free elections" within a short period and to transfer the powers of the revolutionary army to the elected government. But, instead, the elections were never held; political power remained in the hands of the revolutionary militia; ownership of land was transferred to cooperatives and then to state farms; foreign owners were offered long-term bonds instead of immediate payment for expropriated lands; regulation of the economy soon became full-fledged socialism; and, *horribile dictu,* the primary political and economic allegiance of the nation was shifted from the United States to the Soviet Union. All of this, the liberals argue, constitutes a flagrant betrayal of the original aims of the revolution.

But Williams shows how little these writers know of the Cuban situation. He quotes long excerpts from the 1940 Constitution which amply support his contention that the implementation of its provisions demanded revolution, not reform: "It defines the state as the agent of, and charges it with the responsibility for, economic development, social welfare and justice, and the recovery and protection of Cuban national sovereignty." *This* is precisely what Castro understood, as is revealed by a passage (quoted by Williams) in his book *Revolucion,* written in 1957: "The Revolution is struggling for a total transformation of Cuban life, for profound modifications in the system of property and for a change in institutions."

The particular form which the "total transformation of Cuban life" would assure was not predetermined. It would be fashioned by the peculiar circumstances of the Cuban domestic and foreign situation at the moment of Batista's fall. Above

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all it would depend on the response of the United States, since the Cuban economy was a virtual appendage of the American. None of these larger considerations could be controlled from the Sierra Maestra.

Castro's understanding of the revolutionary import of the 1940 Constitution was not shared by other elements of the anti-Batista coalition. This caused the first defections. It was the United States, however, which loomed early as the major problem. Williams' discussion of the intricate relationship between Washington and Havana in 1959 shows clearly how the United States thwarted every effort on Cuba's part to reconcile the revolution with American interests. This set in motion a terrible dialectic of increasing antagonism and mutual reprisals which has not yet seen its ultimate climax. Granting Williams' argument—that Castro had planned from the beginning a radical social revolution—it is evident that the revolutionary government could not accept the American terms. It is equally evident that the neo-imperialist aims of American foreign policy could not be reconciled with the Cuban intentions. But the major share of blame must rest on us: this is the conclusion that emerges in the latter half of Williams' book. On the whole this book is a highly original and beautifully sustained discussion of a very complex problem.

As an alternative to Williams' refutation of the charge of "betrayal," we could assume that Castro did in fact evolve in his thinking, especially in regard to the means by which social justice, equality, and well-being might be attained. Even if Castro did change his mind concerning the need for socialism and the possibilities of cooperation with his North American Big Brother, this does not constitute betrayal of his fundamental ideals. External conditions imposed a pattern of necessity on the course of revolutionary development and severely limited its range of possibilities. Only if he had accepted the other road open to him under the circumstances—allowing Cuba to be bullied into economic and political submission to its Good Neighbor and thus reinstating the repressive and brutal control of the old oligarchy which had given its blessings to Batista—then and only then would the frenzied scream of "betrayal!" have validity.

Thus it was a combination of internal and external necessity which wreaked a transformation in the nature of the Cuban Revolution. Castro discovered for himself three primary truths: (1) that the exigencies of revolution vitiated the demands for so-called "free elections" (whose farcical nature in Latin American history has been amply demonstrated); (2) that cooperatives were much better suited to the needs of Cuban agriculture than were individually-cultivated plots of land; (3) that the dependence of the Cuban

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economy on the sugar crop must be ended. Outside events taught him other lessons. It was unremitting American hostility which catapulted the Revolution directly into its socialist phase and which resulted in its complete dependence upon economic relations with the Communist nations.

This analysis exposes the utter irrelevance of liberalism's charges of betrayal. The alternatives proposed by liberalism are excluded from the realm of possibility. They are often ludicrous: witness the program wherein individual American states "adopt" Latin American nations and tender them in paternal fashion spoonfuls of aid and advice! But perhaps the most profound lesson was one which emerged out of the President's jingoistic antics at the Orange Bowl. His audience of newly-liberated Playa Giron heroes respond wildly to the suggestion of returning to Cuba, but not at all to that of agrarian reform. They are not reformers, but counter-revolutionaries.

Few men risk their lives for the sake of mild reforms. The real tragedy in Latin America's future is that only violent struggle can resolve the fundamental social conflicts which exist there.

A QUARTER-CENTURY OF UNAMERICANA

BY ALEXANDER L. CROSBY

Because Dagmar Wilson taught the House Un-American Activities Committee to leave women alone, Charlotte Pomerantz won't get the subpena she has fully earned. Miss Pomerantz has put together a handsome, oversize paperback entitled *A Quarter-Century of Un-Americana: A Tragico-Comical Memorabilia of HUAC.** The book is a public service of the first magnitude and the committee will find it outrageous.

Miss Pomerantz, a young woman who will be heard of, began to see the facts of American life when liberal Sarah

A former newspaperman and now a free-lance writer of pamphlets and children's books, Mr. Crosby is a frequent contributor to MONTHLY REVIEW.

* Marzani & Munsell, 100 West 23rd Street, New York 11, 1963, 128 pp., $2.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lawrence College fired "the finest teacher I ever had" because he hadn't confessed a past political sin. Her wonderful collection of cartoons, quotations, and brief documents is held together with crisp summaries of the HUAC dynasties, from Martin Dies to Francis E. Walter. Professor H. H. Wilson of Princeton has written a foreword and Publisher Carl Marzani has outlined the background and significance of HUAC (remember when Woodrow Wilson was jailing socialists with the help of a bright young career man named J. Edgar Hoover?). James Baldwin ends the volume with a page of moving comment.

This book is for veterans of the depression years and for college students who never knew a time when there wasn't an Un-American Activities Committee. It is funny, exciting, serious, and shocking. Browsing is almost impossible. As with salted peanuts, you keep reaching for more.

One of the shocking things is how much HUAC history we have forgotten. Miss Pomerantz reminds us that Chairman J. Parnell Thomas took the Fifth before going to prison for defrauding the government. In Danbury jail a companion was Ring Lardner, Jr., one of the Hollywood Ten, who had relied on the First Amendment. "Unlike Thomas, who received full pardon after serving eight and one-half months, the victims of Thomas's Committee were denied parole," the editor notes.

Another notorious chairman was Harold H. Velde. He was a former FBI agent and he reasoned like a Hooverman. Speaking in Congress against mobile libraries for rural areas, Velde said: "Educating American people through means of the library service could bring about a change in their political attitudes quicker than any other method. The basis of all Communism and Socialistic influence is education of the people."

William K. Sherwood, a 41-year-old Stanford University scientist who was working on the riddle of cancer, was subpenaed in June 1957. Fearing assassination by publicity, he killed himself. Four days later, when the hearings opened in San Francisco, Chairman Walter refused to let his widow Barbara read a short statement to the Committee. But the newspapers published the full text, which ended: "Members of the Committee, what you have done and what you are doing is an evil thing. Do not persist in it. Go away, go home, bow your heads in prayer, and ask forgiveness of your God."

Although the Committee does not shrink from bullying a cabinet officer or needling a President, it seems to be afraid of women. And for good cause. No group of witnesses ever chastened the Committee as Women Strike for Peace did last December. Dagmar Wilson and her cohorts gave the nation its finest Xmas present in years.

The book has hundreds of short quotes, from Socrates to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hitler. The great libertarians of today are well represented and so are such clear heads as Katherine Hepburn, E. B. White, and John Steinbeck. My favorite is this, from Jimmy Durante: "Don't put no constrictions on da people. Leave 'em ta hell alone."

The cartoons, beginning with Art Young's classic "Reward for information leading to the apprehension of Jesus Christ," are superbly chosen. It's virtually a full house, with Gropper, Dowling, Interlandi, Shahn, Ajay, Evergood, Bastian, Marcus, Gwathmey, Wright, Partymiller, Pratt, Pierotti and many others. The only major cartoonist not represented is Herbert Block of the Washington *Post*. Curious about his absence, I telephoned the editor and learned that after eight months of correspondence, a vain trip to Washington and a prodding telegram, Herblock finally said no. It is ironic that one of the country's ablest champions of civil liberties should so constrict his own.

Mulling over Miss Pomerantz's book, the thought came to me that the trouble with HUAC may be simply that it has failed to investigate the basic un-American activities. There are many insidious influences today which are undermining the patriotism of the most patriotic citizens. As one easy illustration, what has done most to fill Americans with loathing for the products of free private enterprise? What noxious intrusion into our private lives has made us exclaim, night after night, "What a blessing it would be if all of our soap, canned goods, razor blades, automobiles, tooth paste, beer, and aspirin were made by the government and sold in a quiet and non-musical manner!" I refer of course to the television commercial, the maggot that is eating away the bodies corporate of these United States.

The television commercial is, I believe, of domestic origin, but there is an even noisier enemy of national tranquillity that came from foreign shores. This is *Sternus vulgaris*, the European starling, which was introduced by a New England resident who thought it would be nice to have around us the birds that Shakespeare knew and perchance fed at his feeding station.

The starling has soiled more cornices and desecrated more statues than any vandal since the invention of the pigeon. He has made a rookery of our cherished institutions. He has interfered with the normally separate slumbers of statesmen and scrubwomen. It is true that he has also consumed countless billions of Japanese beetle grubs, but that is nibbling away at the business of the insecticide makers. Further, he is one of the insessorial birds, and that's the kind you wouldn't want your sister to carry.

A clear precedent for the suppression of starlings was set by HUAC sponsorship of the McCarran-Walter immigration law. All we need is an amend-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, closing our gates to these blackbirds forever. Of course the new law would have to be retroactive to the middle of the 19th century, but HUAC would find a way to turn the clock back. It has had practice.

But perhaps the most important area for the Committee to explore is chuck-holes. Freezing and thawing produce millions of these miniature craters in highways from coast to coast. In my neighborhood there are holes big enough to absorb a complete Congressman, even when cloaked with immunity. It would be a pleasure to prove the truth of this statement.

Why are chuckholes a peril to our American way of life? Because they produce blowouts, broken springs, bent axles, and a host of other automotive ailments. Because every driver exclaims when he hits one, "A plague on the highway officials of the township, the county, the state, and the nation." Disrespect of highway officials breeds disrespect of other officials, such as tax collectors. And that way lies anarchy.

I don't know what an investigation of chuckholes would accomplish. But the impossibility of achieving anything has never discouraged the Committee.

Another sticky mess that HUAC ought to get to the bottom of is the crisis in oatmeal. The *Wall Street Journal* says the oats crop last year was the smallest since 1884. When oats bring only 65¢ a bushel, the farmers do better with marihuana. But marihuana is not the dish to build sturdy, red-blooded, red-resistant, American children. If the farmers refuse to cultivate oats, suburbanites may have to sow some in their backyards.

In view of the Congressional zeal for traveling overseas to advance the nation's welfare, it is strange that HUAC has never conducted hearings in Moscow and Peking. Both cities are reported to be centers of un-American activities with distinct socialist coloration. It is true that the crusading Congressman would find it hard, without subpenas, to discover exactly who sent those painfully un-American missiles to Cuba. But it might be possible to persuade Mr. Khrushchev to agree to an exchange program of investigations. While our Dick Tracys held forth in the Kremlin, the Soviet Hawkshaws would gather in Constitution Hall to deal with persons suspected of unsocialistic activities.

Getting into Peking would be harder. Probably the best strategy would be a direct appeal to Mao Tse-tung. Secretary Rusk could cable: "In accordance with your policy of letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend, could you find temporary space in your herbarium for visiting specimens of stinkweed, poison ivy, and skunk cabbage?"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE REAL WEST GERMANY

BY WILLIAM J. BLAKE

Heinz Abosch's study of Germany since 1945 is the first complete survey and analysis of the multiple aspects of the new Germany that has appeared in one book.* Abosch attempts a synthesis of the political, economic, and cultural aspects of the régime that has been touted in the capitalist world as the outstanding example of the dynamic possibilities of capitalism, even after nearly total disaster. For this type of rhetoric, Abosch substitutes a critical study of the factors that have led to the apparently brilliant successes of the Adenauer epoch. The immense accretion of labor power in Western Germany and its low cost are primary, aid from its former adversaries important but secondary. Re-equipment has given German industry a more modern complexion than that of older rivals such as Great Britain and the United States; and the influx of technicians from East Germany and from areas ceded to Poland and Czechoslovakia have been accessory props.

Abosch correlates these developments with allied policy and shows that the West German state was a creation of foreigners, and at first met with indifference or dislike on the part of Germans. Its economic successes led to its acceptance; but that acceptance was not political, merely a compound of indifference and submission. A country that has never been political in our sense is today almost wholly devoid of the memory of such an attitude. In this vacuum, monopoly and militarism have found it easy to re-establish their power. Effectively there is no opposition, not even from the trade unions; and the word socialism for the Social Democratic party is devoid of meaning. It has repudiated the aims of socialism, even in the minimal sense understood by the British Labor Party. The movement wholly lacks theorists and does not wish to have any.

Culturally, the situation is even worse. Money and money alone is the nexus of society. All the older German values—hierarchy, civic duty, academic prowess, even military rank—have lost prestige as compared to money. There are no other

---

The author of *An American Looks at Karl Marx, The Copperheads,* and other noted works of non-fiction and fiction, William J. Blake is currently living and writing in England.

* Heinz Abosch, *Menace of the Miracle: Germany from Hitler to Adenauer,* Monthly Review Press, New York, $5.00.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

values. Literature is at a low ebb and the few writers who are clairvoyant are out of touch with their society, which does not care to read their clear visions of what that society is really like. There has been no recovery from the crash of culture of 1933 which turned Germany from the avant garde of literature and cinema into servile banality, except that from out-and-out barbarism, the Germans have turned to mere trash, presented in the American style in lavish magazines. The cinema is uncreative, and the few good films have a small domestic audience or are even prohibited. All movements in favor of peace are considered treasonable or pro-Communist. The country has the vesture of a democracy but is patently heading for dictatorship.

The other Germany, that of the German Democratic Republic in the East, meets with much greater sympathy on the part of Abosch, and he gives a good appraisal of the reasons why its material prosperity has lagged so far behind the capitalist West of Germany. First, the Russians really exacted reparations for the crimes committed by the Nazis; whereas the West soon showered West Germany with gifts, apparently as a reward for their crimes. Secondly, devastated Russia did not have the means to develop the East, whereas unhurt America emphatically did have the means to re-establish the West. Further, the age-old contempt of the German for the Slav meant that the West German felt he was defeated by his equals, while the Easterner felt that he was defeated by his inferiors and grudged acceptance of such a humiliation. The picture of the East generally lacks a certain tone; that is, Abosch does not sufficiently stress that its entire youth are fully conversant with Nazi crime and the meaning of the Nazi epoch; whereas in the West, the youth are deliberately kept ignorant of all recent German history.

Those sections of Abosch's book devoted to Strauss and the policy of rearmament are rich in new insights. Here we do not meet with the commonplaces of radical criticism. Rather, we can see the interpenetration of the military program and of all other reactionary forces in Germany portrayed concretely and brilliantly.

The limitations of the book are many, mostly of omission; but none of them detracts from its being the indispensable book on Germany for our generation, as was *Behemoth* by Franz Neumann for the epoch ending in the early 1940's. Abosch does not reveal the roots of the immense accumulation of capital in the new Germany: he suggests it, but does not truly state it. Germany in the two previous upsurges—from 1896 to 1914 and from 1922 to 1929—showed a rapidity in the accumulation of capital unrivalled in Europe. It always had a rate of surplus value at least one-third greater

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than that prevailing in Great Britain or France. After 1945 the supply of very cheap labor rose by 30 percent, and the rate of surplus value probably rose over 50 percent above what it had been in the two previous booms. As the workers' demand for consumer goods was small, capital was reinvested in the capital-goods industry at a feverish rate. The internal market, due to the cession of German territory and the founding of the East German state, had shrunk by about 20 percent. This siphoned a great deal of capital-goods production into exports, the rate of which was fantastic, and took away a proportion of the export growth which would have naturally accrued to Great Britain and the United States in the period of world recovery.

Since there are no miracles, the growth of the German economy arose out of these measurable factors. But it was not unique. Abosch's book is a study of the German problem, but rather in isolation. It happens that two other defeated Fascist states, Italy and Japan, have produced similar "miracles." In the case of Italy, there was not merely the same rate of growth but a change in quality—the creation of a new industrialism in a backward economy. And in Japan the rate of growth was far greater than in Germany. Furthermore, the one looted "victor" capitalist state, France, has in the last five years not only caught up with but is surpassing the rate of growth of Germany. The German problem would have been better analyzed, had some attempt been made to separate those factors which were specific to Germany from those which are part of world recovery in the battered economies generally. Also, it may be pointed out that Abosch overstates the disaster to the Germany economy in 1945. At least four-fifths of its manufacturing capacity was intact; some estimates say nearly all. The disaster was mainly in transport and housing.

Most important omission of all is the comparative neglect of the Common Market. Since the Schumann Plan of 1950 and the Monnet Plan which succeeded it, Germany has become the center of a complex of Western European capitalisms. In this way, it has helped to meet the problem of a maturing boom—that is to say, of a diminishing rate of profit, a diminishing rate of growth, and the insistence of labor, due to a shortage of supply, upon increasing its wages in real terms at the expense of capitalist profit.

Germans like Professor Erhard, slated to be Adenauer's successor, are fully aware of the implications of a reduced rate of growth. It is not merely that the rate of profit is diminishing: since 1961 a more ominous sign has appeared, the stagnation or even decline of the *mass* of profit. This description is well given by Abosch, but the implications drawn are not as pre-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cise as they should be. In passing over the Common Market, he has failed to notice that the Germans, by collaboration with France, have sought indirectly to recreate their colonial empire in Africa. Also, by reciprocal arrangements with French heavy industry, they have reduced costs. By their plans for a joint agricultural policy with French interests, however bumpy and contradictory they are, they are seeking a wholesale elimination of their own small farmers, and a lowering of food costs, so as to be able eventually to reduce labor costs. More than that, their arrangements with the Benelux countries have cheapened transport costs to the external world. Erhard has thus not been deaf to the warnings of the fall in stock exchange values which have, on the whole, been the steepest in the world. Here, again, Abosch thinks of the military budget, which is today comparable with that of other countries, as a drag on the recovery of German capitalism. But this is to argue by analogy with the past. There is little doubt that the tiny military budget from, say, 1948 to 1957, while Germany's rivals had heavy military budgets (and France even disastrous wars) greatly helped the German export potential. But that was when profits were on the upgrade. When profits are on the downgrade, military orders may well sustain the capital goods industries and stave off a sharp recession.

A smaller omission will be of concern to socialists. Under the Weimar Republic, German Social Democracy, while not as punch-drunk as in the Adenauer era, was as treacherous to the cause of socialism. Yet it then had at its helm theorists like Hilferding, Kautsky, Cunow, Bauer, Naphtali, and a host of others. How has it come about that the present "socialist" movement in Germany is not merely indifferent to theory but actually hostile to the use of the brain as such? There must be a social reason for it, but none is disclosed.

But the above remarks do not in any way diminish the value of what is undoubtedly the most important book on the menace of Western German militarism and monopoly power that has been published since the war. The author is learned, sensitive, humane, and satisfying; not to have read the book is to be ignorant of the most dangerous situation in Europe and possibly in the world today. To have read it is to be armed with such information and analysis as can lead to an intelligent further exploration of the subject.

Wherever there is an interest and power to do wrong, wrong will be done.

—*James Madison*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A BOOK ANNOUNCEMENT

BY THE EDITORS

In our 11-year experience of book publishing we have compiled a list of 50 titles of which we are justly proud. We are presently reading galleys of another book to be published in December—one of the most important in MR Press history. It is ***Puerto Rico: Freedom and Power in the Caribbean*** by Gordon Lewis.

THE BOOK

Puerto Rico for too long has been held up by official United States sources as a "showcase of democracy" and a model of American responsibilities in the Western Hemisphere. This book separates fact and myth and portrays in scholarly detail the realities of modern Puerto Rico—its combination of real economic progress and socio-political retardation, its cultural distress and disorganization arising out of American penetration, its continuing neo-colonial character as an American tropical dependency, the humiliating status of Puerto Ricans as second-class American citizens, the need for independence and socialism as the twin answers to the Puerto Rican tragedy. The author treats the subject historically and descriptively, so that the book is at once an account of Puerto Rico as a colony, first under Spain and after 1898 under the United States, and a systematic analysis of all aspects of contemporary Puerto Rican life—politics, education, labor, social class, economic organization, the machinery of government, and much else.

At the same time, the author places the island-society within its Caribbean setting and its general Hemispheric environment, thus counterbalancing the limited vision of most existing books on Puerto Rico which see the island as simply a tropical extension of the American Way of Life. The book is therefore not only a portrait of a contemporary underdeveloped country going through the double trauma of Americanization and modernization but also, in effect, a description of the general Caribbean society of which Puerto Rico is only a Hispanoamerican particular expression. It thus illuminates the Caribbean background which in recent years has spawned Caribbean nationalism, the decline of colonialism, the fall of the Caribbean "little Caesars" like Trujillo, and, above all, the Cuban Revolution. Puerto Rico is seen here in its threefold capacity as (1) a fascinating society in its own right, (2) a case study in American neo-colonialism in its most modern form, and (3) a prototype of the increasingly important and explosive Caribbean region. The book establishes itself, beyond doubt, as the definitive work on the subject.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AUTHOR

Gordon Lewis is a Welshman who came to the United States in 1948 and has been living in Puerto Rico since 1955. A professional historian and political scientist, he was educated in history at the University of Wales, the School of Modern Greats at Balliol College, Oxford, and the Department of Government at Harvard, from which latter university he holds a doctoral degree. He has traveled extensively both within the United States and the Caribbean and brings to this treatment of Puerto Rico and the Caribbean a unique blend of informed and friendly interest in American life and politics and ideological commitment to the European socialist tradition. He has been, and still is, a member of the British Labor Party.

Dr. Lewis has taught extensively in American universities, including the University of Chicago, Brandeis University, the University of California at Los Angeles and, more briefly, Michigan State University. He is currently Associate Professor in the College of Social Sciences at the University of Puerto Rico. He lives in Puerto Rico with his Trinidadian wife and family.

PREPUBLICATION PRICE

This is the longest book we have ever published—640 pages. And it is also the most expensive, because we have spared no expense in our effort to produce a fine book, one which in format—type, paper, presswork, binding—will match the superb quality of the contents.

Our costs to date are extremely high and it is already clear to us that the list price of the book will have to be at least $10 per copy. That's a lot of money—our highest priced book to date. We need capital to finance this big undertaking, and you, our readers, need to get your books more cheaply. There is a practical solution to this problem—a prepublication price so low that it will benefit you to order the book in advance, and so supply us with the necessary capital.

Accordingly, we are offering the book at a prepublication discount of at least 50 percent—$5 per copy. The book is entitled ***Puerto Rico: Freedom and Power in the Caribbean*** and that is what it is about. But it is more than that—it is a course in political science comparable to the best work of Harold Laski. It is a book which all serious-minded people, concerned with the problems of the underdeveloped countries, will want to own.

We ask you to help us—and help yourself—by ordering the book NOW at the bargain prepublication price of only $5.

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Ave. N. Y. 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A FRABJOUS AND (we hope) IRRESISTIBLE OFFER!

A QUARTER-CENTURY OF UN-AMERICANA,
Charlotte Pomerantz, Ed. paperback $2.50
Should make millions of Americans laugh—Archibald MacLeish

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE RIVER by Edgar Snow,
cloth, $10.00
One of the most important books of the decade
—Huberman and Sweezy

THE GREAT QUOTATIONS by George Seldes, cloth, $15.00
A collection of man's best thinking—J. Donald Adams
The editor of *In Fact* took 20 years to compile its 912-pages, from Confucius to Castro; 10,000 quotations, 90% not in Bartlett's.

ALL THREE YOURS FOR ONLY $18.00 (total value $27.50). Or, you can order *Un-Americana* and one of the others for $9.00 (saving up to $8.50); or any book separately at 20% discount. We pay postage.

Dear Sirs:
☐ I want all three books. Enclosed $18.00
☐ Enclosed $9.00. Send me *Un-Americana* and _____
☐ Enclosed $_____. Send me _____
Name _____
Address _____
City _____ Zone _____ State _____

MARZANI & MUNSELL, Publishers 100 W. 23 St., N. Y. 11

(advertisement)

Africa Latin America Asia
REVOLUTION

An illustrated monthly review for and about the Third World, founded in Algeria and now published in Switzerland for a world-wide audience

First issues still available:

No. 1 (May 1963): Ben Bella, Oliver Tambo, Agostinho Neto, the liberation struggles in South Africa and Angola, etc. . . .

No. 2 (June 1963): Mao Tse-tung interview; Charles Bettelheim, "The Economy of Tropical Africa"; "The War in Portuguese Guinea," etc.

No. 3 (July 1963): 25-page photo history of the Cuban Revolution; Jack Woddis, "Ghana Builds Socialism," etc.

JUST OUT: August-September double issue (224 pages), featuring a photo history of the Afro-American struggle.

Subs.: America $6. Europe: 40 s. or 26 frs. Africa 24s.
Special introductory sub for MR readers: $1.25 (3 mos.)

REVOLUTION, Mètropole 10-11 Lausanne, Switzerland

(advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now publishing quarterly . . .

STUDIES ON THE LEFT

(Vol. III, No. 3)

a journal of research, social theory and review

In this issue:

Emile Capouya, After the Failure of Nerve
Staughton Lynd, Socialism, the Forbidden Word

William A. Williams Replies to Theodore Draper

and other articles, communications and reviews by **Irving L. Horowitz, Eugene D. Genovese, Alan B. Spitzer, Saul Landau,** and **Lawrence Goldman**

First English Translations of Two Essays by
KARL MANNHEIM

In our next issues:

Irving L. Horowitz, on the unfinished writings of C. Wright Mills

Isaac Deutscher, on the Sino-Soviet Dispute

William Worthy, on Felix Greene and Edgar Snow on China

William A. Williams, on American Intervention in Russia, 1918-1919

SUBSCRIBE NOW: 4 issues, $3.50, Singles, $1.00 (Back issues available)

Mail to: STUDIES ON THE LEFT, Box 33, Planetarium Station, New York 24, N.Y.

Enclosed is $..... for .....

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

(advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS

CLOTH BOOKS

	List Price	Price with Sub*
THREE TACTICS: THE BACKGROUND IN MARX by Stanley Moore	$2.25	$7.00
POLITICS AND LAW IN SOUTH AFRICA by Julius Lewin	2.95	7.50
WHITHER LATIN AMERICA? by Carlos Fuentes and others	3.00	7.50
REPORT TO THE STOCKHOLDERS by John Beecher	3.00	7.50
THE UNITED STATES, CUBA, AND CASTRO by William A. Williams	3.25	8.00
THE SECOND REVOLUTION IN CUBA by J. P. Morray	3.25	8.00
CUBA—ANATOMY OF A REVOLUTION by Huberman and Sweezy	3.50	8.00
GUERRILLA WARFARE by Che Guevara	3.50	8.00
CROSSING THE LINE by Claud Cockburn	3.50	8.00
AN ESSAY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PLANNING by Maurice Dobb	3.50	8.00
THE LIFE AND IDEAS OF ROBERT OWEN by A. L. Morton	3.50	8.00
WELLINGTON ROAD by Margaret Lassell	3.75	8.50
VIEW FROM THE WEST by Claud Cockburn	3.75	8.50
BURNING CONSCIENCE by Claude Eatherly and Gunther Anders	4.00	8.50
THE ALIENATION OF MODERN MAN by Fritz Pappenheim	4.00	8.50
PRIDE OF STATE by J. P. Morray	4.00	8.50
TIDE WITHOUT TURNING by John Gill	4.50	9.00
THE MENACE OF THE MIRACLE: GERMANY FROM HITLER TO ADENAUER by Heinz Abosch	5.00	9.00
THE EMPIRE OF OIL by Harvey O'Connor	5.00	9.00
THE WALL BETWEEN by Anne Braden	5.00	9.00
THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF GROWTH by Paul A. Baran	5.00	9.00

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOW IN PRINT

MR PRESS

	List Price	Price with Sub
NORTH FROM MEXICO by Carey McWilliams	5.00	9.00
THE PRESENT AS HISTORY by Paul M. Sweezy	5.00	9.00
THE THEORY OF CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT by Paul M. Sweezy	6.00	10.00
THE RAGGED TROUSERED PHILANTHROPISTS by Robert Tressell	6.00	10.00
THE GREAT ROAD by Agnes Smedley	6.75	10.50
EDUCATION AND THE WORKING CLASS by Jackson and Marsden	6.75	10.50
CASTE, CLASS & RACE by Oliver C. Cox	7.50	11.00
WORLD CRISIS IN OIL by Harvey O'Connor	7.50	11.00
FROM YALTA TO DISARMAMENT by J. P. Morray	8.50	12.00

(* *All foreign subs, add $1 to price quoted*)

MR PRESS

PAPERBACKS

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION
by James Boggs $1.00

CAPITALISM YESTERDAY AND TODAY
by Maurice Dobb (flexible cloth binding) 1.00

THE ALIENATION OF MODERN MAN
by Fritz Pappenheim 1.25

AMERICAN RADICALS: SOME PROBLEMS AND PERSONALITIES
Harvey Goldberg, editor 1.25

AMERICAN LABOR IN MIDPASSAGE
Bert Cochran, editor 1.25

WHITHER LATIN AMERICA?
by Carlos Fuentes and Others 1.45

MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS
by Leo Huberman 1.75

CUBA: ANATOMY OF A REVOLUTION
by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy 1.75

THE PRESENT AS HISTORY
by Paul M. Sweezy (flexible cloth binding) 2.95

Total $13.65

PAPERBACK SPECIAL All the above books $11.00

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(continued from inside back cover)

the China-India Border Dispute. We could not fill the order—the newsstand "returns" were very small and our extra supply of copies has long been depleted. If you do not save your copies of MR, *please* send us your copy. In return you may have your choice of any MR Press pamphlet or paperback. Send us the title you want, along with your January, 1963 copy of MR.

In March, 1961, while Dr. Fred Schwartz's "Christian Anti-Communist Crusade" was in Phoenix, the Arizona State Legislature passed a disclaimer oath as part of a "Communist Control Act." Three teachers, believing the oath to be unconstitutional, refused to sign. They have been working without pay since June, 1961. They are appealing their case to the U.S. Supreme Court and, as always, such appeals cost a lot of money. If you want to help, send your contributions to Richard Gorby, Treasurer, Emergency Committee to Defend Liberties of Arizona Public Employees, 2648 North Fair Oaks, Tuscon, Arizona.

A reader writes: "Keep up the good work, and please don't let this book go out of print. *It made a socialist out of me.*" The book, *Man's Worldly Goods,* has "made a socialist" out of many thousands of people all over the world. Do you have a friend who needs one more little push? See page 287 for the list of MR Press Paperbacks, including *Man's Worldly Goods.*

Every time we read a press release from SNCC, CORE, and the other Negro organizations active in the Negro revolt, in both North and South, we get that feeling one gets only in the presence of real heroes. A friend of MR, obviously affected in the same way, has sent us $300 "for 100 trial subs at $3 each (6 months) to go to 100 of the *younger* college or professional people working in the struggle for civil rights and freedom." The implication of this meaningful gift—that MR will be useful to these young fighters in their courageous work—is heartwarming to us. We are going to begin these 6-month subs with the Boggs paperback, which, we feel, is the kind of informative, stimulating book that can indeed be helpful. If you want to join in this venture to bring MR for 6 months to the young people on the firing line right now, send us your contribution, earmarked to whatever fighting organization or Negro college libraries you select—or we will do the selecting for you, if that is your desire.

Michael Munk, *Guardian* staff member, will speak on "Jobs and Jim Crow" at Adelphi Hall, 74 Fifth Avenue, N.Y., under the auspices of the Militant Labor Forum, on Friday, September 27. Contribution, $1; students, 50¢.

The tragic news comes from Peking that, on August 9th, our brilliant friend, Dr. Chi Chao-ting, died of apoplexy. A vice-president of the board of directors of the Bank of China and chairman of the Council for the Promotion of International Trade, Dr. Chi was the head of most of China's international trade missions. We met him first when he was studying at Columbia in the late 1930's, and it was our good fortune to see him again in Mexico in January of this year. His death is a grievous blow to his country and to his many friends all over the world.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)
works and what it looks like from the viewpoint of a Latin American. It is entitled *Latin America and the Alliance for Progress,* by Alonso Aguilar. The author studied economics at N.Y.U. and Columbia before assuming his present post as Professor of Economics at the National University of Mexico. His pamphlet, which will be priced at 50¢, is the best short account of the subject we have seen. With the Vietnam pamphlet and 10 others it makes up our Pamphlet Packet which should be in every socialist's library. See page 257 for complete list.

In line with our decision to focus our attention on the Negro revolt at home and Latin America abroad, MR Press will soon publish two books that we think make important contributions in different ways. The first, entitled *Puerto Rico: Freedom and Power in the Caribbean* by Gordon Lewis, is a detailed, definitive study (for details see our announcement on pages 282-283). The second, *The Man at the Door with the Gun,* is by Cedric Belfrage, the Editor-in-Exile of the *National Guardian.* This much shorter book takes the reader on a sightseeing tour of many Latin countries, but the sights that Belfrage sees are not on the usual tourist's agenda. Ready—we hope—in November.

Scott Nearing was a delegate to the Continental Conference for Solidarity with Cuba held in Brazil in March. In a pamphlet recently published, entitled *Cuba and Latin America,* Scott fills in the U.S. news gap with his account of the exciting meetings—sabotaged, restricted, banned, and finally held. The pamphlet, published by New Century Publishers, can be ordered from the Social Science Institute, Harborside, Maine. 35¢ per copy, three for $1.

You have probably never heard of Hiroshima Rest House, but if you were one of the survivors of the blast that wiped the city off the face of the earth, you would know it well. Twenty percent of the 100,000 survivors of the Bomb are today still invalided or unwell. For them, six years ago, Hiroshima Rest House was opened and has served as a haven ever since. The founders, two friends of MR, can no longer shoulder the financial burden alone and this month they have started a general appeal for funds. Americans, particularly, have a responsibility to help keep open this social center and hostel for the survivors of the A-Bomb. Contributions, which are tax-exempt under U.S. Treasury regulations, should be sent to Hiroshima Rest House Foundation, c/o Battle, Fowler, Stokes, and Kheel, 477 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y.

In its obituary of our good friend, Harry Sacher, who died in May, the *New York Times* wrote that he was "described by judges and other lawyers as one of the best trial lawyers in the nation." He was that—and more. He was a man. Here is part of his testimony before the McClellan Committee:

> I refuse to bend the knee to an inquiry concerning my innermost thoughts and beliefs, whether they be on politics, religion or anything else. My conscience dictates to me that I shall not, under compulsion, answer today any more than John Freeborn Lilliburne answered in the 1640's to the Court of Star Chamber and on the same grounds, Mr. Chairman, on the grounds that it is incompatible with the dignity of the individual to make compulsory disclosure of his thoughts and his ideas and his beliefs. . . .

A memorial meeting will be held on September 26 at the Henry Hudson Hotel, 353 West 57th Street, New York, at 8:00 P.M.

We had a request recently from an Ambassador of a country in Asia for four copies of our January 1963 issue containing our article on

(*continued on facing page*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS

announces 4 new books
on which you can save money by ordering NOW

1. **PUERTO RICO: FREEDOM AND POWER IN THE CARIBBEAN**

By GORDON LEWIS

Price on publication date: probably $10
Prepublication price: $ 5

2. **THE MAN AT THE DOOR WITH THE GUN**

By CEDRIC BELFRAGE

Price on publication date: probably $4.00
Prepublication price: $2.50

3. **A PHILOSOPHY OF MAN**

By ADAM SCHAFF

Price on publication date: $3.25
Prepublication price: $2.25

4. **SOVIET EDUCATION TODAY**

By DEANA LEVIN

Price on publication date: $4.00
Prepublication price: $2.50

ORDER NOW AND SAVE

To those who order at prepublication prices, books will be sent as soon as they come off the press.
Nos. 3 and 4 above are now available.

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Ave. New York 14, N.Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED